

THE  
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

---

JULY, 1874.

---

I.—THE PRESBYTERY, THE PRELACY, AND THE  
EVANGELIST.

THE recent discussions of the subject of Church Government illustrate again how fragmentary all our thinking is apt to be, even where a well-rounded survey of the whole question is most desirable and most necessary. The advocates of the Presbytery and of the Prelacy imagine their respective theories to take in all the three hundred and sixty degrees of the great circle. The *Presbytery*, as here used, relates to that which puts all rule into the hands of the presbyters, or elders, of individual congregations, without any officer of wider official relation to the Churches of districts or sections of country. The *Prelacy* is that which, for general purposes of Church government, puts prelates, or bishops, authoritatively over the congregations and local officers of a district or diocese. Principles of great value, as well as errors of great magnitude, are inherent in each of these fragments of truth. The Presbytery system is right in so far as it teaches the authority of elders in single congregations, and denies the authority of prelates over them. It is defective in so far as it does not teach the necessity and Scripturalness of other officers of a wider field of operations for the general work of the Church. The Prelacy is right in teaching the necessity and Divine appointment of such officers, but is wrong in erecting these into a

hierarchy, with ecclesiastical rule over every thing within their respective dioceses.

The right of the Presbytery to superintend their own congregations is an unquestionable one. The necessity of some more general officers for the general good of the Church is no more to be questioned. The Scripture authority for laborers of larger territorial range than that assigned to elders can be readily pointed out; but that these should be diocesan bishops can not be proved from the Bible.

The main question to be settled is, *Do the Scriptures speak of any officer in the Church who, though not a prelate, has a more general supervision of things than the elder?* Without hesitation we answer, that the *evangelist* is the officer that meets all the necessities of the Church beyond the position and work of the local elder. His existence as an officer in the Church will first be established; then his authority and his work will be defined. The continuation of the office of evangelists after the days of Timothy and his contemporaries being denied by some, and by authors of no mean ability, shall also receive attention as we go along. The term "office of evangelist" is used because we consider his official relations are as real, as indispensable, and as well defined as the "office of a bishop." Although the phrase is not represented in the New Testament by any one Greek word, the following considerations, it is thought, will fully justify its use:

1. No body, politic or ecclesiastic, can operate *as a body* with local officers only. Township officers alone, acting independently of each other, could never manage the affairs of a county. There must be also county officers. These alone could not manage the affairs of the State. For their civil government, the Jews had elders of the city, elders of the tribes, and elders of Israel—the whole people. This was so arranged in the wisdom of God himself; and, if the Church is to move in any thing as a body, she needs more than the local officers of each congregation. If, contrary to what we assume all through this article, the Churches were never intended to act together in any thing, the present argument is useless and void. If they are as separate as the panes of glass in a window, with a non-conductor between each of them, they need no general workers. But, if mutual support and co-operation of the whole are at all

involved, it is most unreasonable to assume that local elders and deacons complete the official list in the Church of Christ.

2. As "the things that were written aforetime were written for our instruction," for "ensamples to us," and all having "a shadow of good things to come," it becomes us to look into the ministry of the Jewish Church, which had the services not only of synagogue elders, whose rank was about the same as that of elders in the Christian Church, but also of the *prophets*, whose position and work in Israel corresponded well to that of the primitive evangelists, or preachers of the gospel. The Jewish prophets were God's great preachers at large to the people. *Foretelling future events* was but a small part of their business. Their main work was to "preach righteousness in the great congregation," in cities, in countries, and to individuals, and generally to fill the place of an itinerant ministry. They were not only preachers of "righteousness according to the law," but preached that gospel "which he had promised aforetime by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures." "The Holy Spirit testified in them beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." And although it was "not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister" this gospel, they were none the less God's preachers in the Jewish age. Jonah was commanded to "arise, and go unto Nineveh, and preach unto it the preaching that I bid thee," and Isaiah was "anointed to preach the gospel to the poor." Nor were they local officers, preaching only in their respective places of worship; for God says to Jeremiah (i, 5), "I ordained thee a prophet *unto the nations*." "See, I have this day set thee over the kingdoms and the nations, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant." "Thou shalt go to all to whom I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee, thou shalt speak." This is all very similar to the language used in commissioning the apostles to "go into all the world." The words "send," "go," "preach," "to the nations," "plant," "build," are often applied to both, and indicate a close correspondence in their respective positions and relations to the people. Such was not the duty of Jewish *elders*, nor did local officers complete the organization of their Church; and, unless it can be shown that their ministry was no guide to ours, local officers can not complete the organization of the Christian Church.

In crossing from the old to the new dispensation, we discover the

evangelists taking the same relative position and work in the new Church that were held by the prophets in the old. They had local officers, but were themselves sent to the nations to root out, to throw down, to build, and to plant—a work that must be done to the end of time. This the local pastors can not do, and were never commanded to do. There are these two very distinguishable departments of labor, no more to be confounded than the labors of a synagogue elder and the “evangelical prophet,” Isaiah. The evangelic office, when traced to its source, will be found to have taken its rise in the old dispensation. It is one of the “good things to come,” foreshadowed in the ministry of those holy men of God, who spake as they, too, were moved by the Holy Spirit. There was a “spirit and a power” about such men as Elias that comforted those that mourned, and made kings and nations tremble, as they bore all special messages at large from God to men.

Not only were the Old Testament prophets preachers, but the New Testament preachers are often called prophets. John the Baptist, the greatest of prophets, came “*preaching* in the wilderness of Judea.” The same combination of preacher and prophet was seen in Christ himself. “The Prophet of the Highest” was sent to “preach the gospel to the poor.” The Old Testament prophet was a preacher, and the New Testament preacher was a prophet. Hence, Barnabas and Paul, Judas and Silas, were all prophets. “Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon, and Lucius, and Manaen, and Saul.” (Acts xiii, 1.) “And Judas and Silas, being prophets, also themselves exhorted the brethren with many words, and comforted them.” (Acts xv, 32.) It seems, then, that the principles of God’s administration in both dispensations are the same as to local and general officers in his kingdom; and, if so, no Church is Scripturally organized that ignores the one class or the other. If the office of prophet, or preacher at large, was not lost in passing to the new dispensation, the *office* of preacher, or evangelist, is inherent in the Christian Church. Elders were ordained in the Churches without any explanation of the meaning of the word, because of its previous use in the synagogue, and prophets, preachers, or evangelists, were ordained not as a new and unheard-of class of ministers; and we may hence conclude that their relative positions are not to be changed, and neither of them to



be abolished without express command. Prophecy, in the sense of foretelling, has "ceased," as well as tongues and supernatural knowledge; but prophets, in the sense of preachers, who "shall speak whatsoever I command them," shall never cease.

§ 1. If, then, the organization of the Christian Church conforms at all to the "patterns of heavenly things," there must be a regularly ordained and supervisory itinerant ministry; otherwise, the things written aforetime are only calculated to mislead us. So far the advocates of the Prelacy are right, and the advocates of the Presbytery are wrong. Timothy, Titus, Tychicus, and scores of other evangelical prophets, whose names may be counted in the New Testament, are the continuation of God's itinerancy, preaching no longer a gospel in prospect, but a gospel in fact. What their peculiar duties and authority are, will be seen after we shall have examined the question of their continuance in the Church after the first generation succeeding the apostles. We shall then mark out the difference between a prelate and an evangelist, and show what the Church has lost by dropping the latter entirely out of her official list—lost her independence, and gained Popery and ecclesiastical tyranny.

§ 2. That the office of evangelist still inheres legitimately in the organization of the Church, may be admitted from the following considerations:

1. That prophets were in the Jewish Church, not only at the beginning of that dispensation, but till its close. The necessity of such officers, all through that age to the last year of it, was emphasized by the sending of the greatest of all the prophets to close up the era, and to hand over every thing to a prophet greater still than he. So far as this goes, it proves it to be untrue that the antitypes, or successors of the prophets, the evangelists, were to be of only temporary duration in the Christian age. If Jewish itinerant preachers were needed to the last day of that dispensation, why will not Christian itinerants be even more necessary under the missionary dispensation of Christ? The parallel here found is unconquerably set against the notion that evangelists were intended to be discontinued soon after the beginning of the Christian dispensation. Their continuance is therefore to be assumed, in the absence of definite proof to the contrary.

2. "The things thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the

same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." Among other things that Timothy had heard of Paul was: "Do the work of an evangelist;" "Ordain elders in every city;" "Charge some that they teach no other doctrine;" Teach the inexperienced elders, "publicly, and from house to house;" and, "Set in order whatever is wanting." Commit all these things to faithful men, and these to others, reaching the fourth generation from Paul; and who has a right to stop the succession there?

3. The work enjoined upon the early evangelists will require officers to perform it as long as the Church of Christ exists upon earth—preaching the gospel, organizing Churches, baptizing the believers, ordaining officers, looking after the destitute in all the Cretes, Galatias, and Dalmatias of the world.

4. The Church had no ministerial element in it at first that will not be needed till the end of time. The apostles are still in the Church, in all that made them apostles—in their authority, their teaching, and in their miraculous testimony to the truth of this religion. The prophets, likewise, leave behind them, in the Scriptures, all the miraculous testimony there was in their prevision of future events, while the personal preaching element of their ministry, as well as that of the apostles, is continued, as we have before shown, in the evangelists.

This brings us to notice the strange assumption that, while pastors and teachers, and all the other classes of ministries, are continued in the Church, the evangelist's office was intended to be abolished after the death of Titus and his contemporaries. The race of evangelists, it seems, was to become extinct, and nothing but their fossil remains was ever intended to come down to us as we find them imbedded in the three Pastoral Epistles. This conclusion is drawn from Paul's saying that these ministries were given to the Church "till" the members should all "come to the unity of the faith," etc. It is tacitly assumed that this "unity," and this "measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ," were attained, once for all, about the time the New Testament revelation was completed, and that, as soon as the canon was finished, the ministry was, somehow, to be reduced; that as soon as the armory was full, the artillery and ammunition all ready, and a great increase of soldiers in the field, the generals were all to be retired, leaving the captains over local companies to manage

the entire host. The apostles were dead; the prophets were no more; the evangelists had been "retired," and nothing left in the Church but the local elders, or pastors, and deacons. Should any rising thought reply, "We have traveling preachers left," we inquire, What are preachers, if they are neither apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, nor teachers? If they belong to none of these classes, you make a new set of officers unknown in the Bible. The preachers must belong to some class of functionaries mentioned in the Scriptures; but if none of those now exist except the local officers, who are the preachers who are not local officers?

It is true that these various "gifts" were to continue to the Church only "till" a certain time. But when will all have come to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God? *Not till the end of the Christian dispensation.* Was Paul confining his remarks and his cares to those of his own day, and providing for their growth only? Was he not, as usual, looking adown the ages to all poor, feeble saints needing ministerial aid in "growing up into him in all things?" As soon as one generation arrives at the desired stature of Christ, is there not another ready to be cared for? But why argue the case, when the limitation of office applies as well to pastors and teachers as to evangelists? If the one was to cease, the other was; for there was nothing said about the office of evangelists terminating that was not said, also, concerning all the rest. If one ceased, they all ceased; and we have now no authorized ministry on earth.

A final reason for retaining the office of evangelist in the Church is found in the fact that inexperienced elders of the first century often needed their aid and instructions. Elders then, as well as now, were not all intelligent preachers, or even intelligent laymen. Paul's speech before those of Ephesus shows that he had instructed them very fully in the duties of their office; and if those converted and ordained by an apostle had need of it, others would not be apt to need it less. Besides these, it appears that the elders of Crete were incapable of managing their affairs alone, even after Titus had been with them for some time, setting things in order. To this evangelist Paul says, "When I shall send Artemus or Tychicus unto thee, come to me to Nicopolis." They could not be left yet without an evangelist; and such has been the case with hundreds of elders,

in every age, till this day. And even now nothing could be of more value to many an eldership than to have a wise, experienced, godly evangelist visit them and help them—conferring upon questions of discipline, methods of edification, pastoral labor, Sunday-schools, Church finance, missionary matters, and solving questions of policy in the general management of the Church. Nor will the Christian Church ever be Scripturally and fully organized until such arrangements shall have been made.

As an historic fact, it must be admitted that not many decades after the death of the apostles, the office of evangelist was actually dropped out of the polity of the Church—a sad fact, too, out of which grew the entire system of Prelacy; and, sadder still, the entire system of Popery itself. If the Divine system of Church government had been adhered to, Popery would have been an impossibility. That a supervision must be exercised over the general interests of the Church, we have already shown; but Timothy, Titus, and such like, performed this duty without contributing the least to the growth of any such thing as diocesan episcopacy. Every Church had its own bishops; but there were evangelists through all the districts, who, by the very nature of their work, were kept among the most needy congregations, aiding the elders in their respective labors, and “strengthening the things that remain.” There is so great a difference between a diocesan bishop governing all his Churches from his head-quarters, by the elders as his deputies, and a Titus traveling through Crete, Macedonia, and other provinces needing his presence, that the one tends directly to the development of Popery, and the other cuts himself off from all opportunity of locating and building up a hierarchy at any one place. It is not a little remarkable that God’s own method of Church government accomplishes all the general good that episcopacy seeks to effect, and all the local good the Presbytery aims at, without the possibility of damage to the true independence of the Churches, or to their general interests; and no greater calamity has ever fallen upon Christendom than the loss of this office; for the mystery of iniquity began to work as an embryo Pope as soon as evangelists were put out of the way.

It may be objected that a provincial bishop and a district evangelist might differ too little for the broad distinction here made between them. But, besides the points made above, he is, in other

respects, antipodal to a prelate. The diocesan claims and exercises such authority over the members and inferior clergy of his district, that he can say to one, "Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh." The evangelist exerts a great influence also, but on a very different principle. He claims no authority of his own, but goes forth simply *as a bearer of God's authority*. What he can do with this, he does. If the Church or the world will not yield to the Word, he has no pains nor penalties to inflict. He may, and should induce the Churches to punish unruly and bad men; but this is done through the Church and her own officers. Nor does he command his brethren in the manner of a bishop. Paul's manner indicates the kind of influence he exerts: "As touching our brother Apollos, I greatly desired him to come unto you with the brethren; but *his* will was not at all to come at this time, but he will come when he shall have convenient season." (1 Cor. xvi, 12.) To Philemon, another minister and fellow-laborer, Paul says, "Without thy mind, I would do nothing." Again: "Though I might be much bold in Christ to enjoin thee that which is convenient, yet, for love's sake, I rather beseech thee." Such should be the bearing of all evangelists—depending on the power of love, and supported only by the authority of the Word of God.

As to the extent of an evangelist's authority, it may be said that, like elders, he has authority to do whatever God has commanded—to preach, to baptize, ordain, set in order, collect money for charitable uses, reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and teaching, and whatever else he has been authorized to do. But a man who is fit for such a work will neither parade nor think about his own personal authority; for he will know that of himself he has no authority whatever. Even the apostles never exhibited *their* authority, but went forth under God's authority, with messages of love, alike to wandering sinners and to feeble saints.

We engage in no logomachy over the phrase "office of an evangelist." The word *office* is used in the Bible thirty-eight times, and in thirty-seven of these it means simply *the work or business which a person is appointed to perform*. The word is never applied to the Jewish prophets, nor even to the twelve apostles. Paul magnified his "office"—the work or business he was appointed to. We have before shown that evangelists' business corresponded in the main to

the work of the prophets, and no one hesitates to admit that they were special officers in God's ancient kingdom. If the "work of an evangelist," such as is described in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, is not a specific business that they were appointed to do, those of the elder and deacon are not. Indeed, there is much more space in these Epistles devoted to describing the duties of the former than of the latter. The disposition to apply official titles to deacons and elders, and even dignitaries not known to the Bible, and yet deny any official status to an evangelist who is preaching and superintending for the Lord in the wider though more destitute regions, only marks how far we have departed from primitive order, and how much of the ancient order of things we have yet to restore. Most of all is there a slowness to believe that a sufficient number of our evangelists should be appointed by the Churches to superintend the work even in the feeblest parts of the moral vineyard. Supervisory care by the elders is freely accepted; but we are slow to admit that we have any elders themselves who need aid, as in ancient Crete and Ephesus. We are so fearful of ecclesiasticism that we can scarcely trust the Scriptures themselves as to the best methods of helping the weak. We use the word *evangelist* freely, but carefully exclude from it the idea of his supervising any of the general affairs of the Church, except by courtesy. He may travel, hold protracted meetings, or even be a missionary in a district; but his official status bears no resemblance whatever to that of Titus in Crete. There is a tacit assumption that not only have the apostles no successors, but that even Titus and his colleagues have none. Hence, all anti-episcopal Churches alike have failed, not only to restore the evangelic office as a part of Church organization, but have no officers at large at all. Some evangelists may labor for, and represent, several congregations; some may superintend the affairs of needy districts, or even States; some may not be needed in any supervisory work at all, but travel under the authority of their own Churches, and preach the Gospel; but all such men should be set apart to whatever work they engage in, and be recognized, like elders and deacons, as *officers* in an important department of Church work. Our missionary evangelists at present are *tolerated* as a pretty good outside arrangement. It is assumed that the New Testament has made no provision for them; that they form no part of the organization of the body of Christ;



that their position is but temporary, and that they may be retired from duty the same as a college financial agent or a distributor of tracts. Should the eldership be pronounced an outside arrangement, to be used or not at pleasure, it would produce precisely the effect in all our minds that should now exist against the accidental unofficial position of evangelists.

It is interesting to note the awkward resorts of the different Protestant Churches to fill places occupied only by the early evangelists with agencies unnamed in the Bible. All feel the need of such field-officers, and, not seeing the precise way to supply them, abnormal developments are the result. All of the Episcopal type have appointed *bishops* to fill the places of Timothy, Silas, and others, and have imagined that Timothy was "ordained first Bishop of Ephesus." Presbyterians, very properly rejecting the Prelacy, and at the same time unacquainted with the Evangelist system, adopt the cumbersome method of supervising their ministry, discipline, and other special interests, by whole presbyteries, synods, and assemblies. Timothy alone was authorized to "charge some that they teach no other doctrine," without waiting to call a convention to decide upon the conduct of every prater against God and the truth. The economy of this is Divine.

The Baptists, possessing as great antipathy to the Prelacy, and as little acquainted with the real "work of evangelists" as the Presbyterians, are working a far less successful contrivance than they for effecting their general purposes—less successful, because their associations do not compare with presbyteries and synods in point of power with their Churches and ministry. Hence their comparative inefficiency in raising missionary, Church-extension, and such like funds for benevolent purposes. Their extreme views of Church independency have cheated them out of co-operative power. True, they, as well as others, have home missionaries, colporteurs, and other general agents; but these occupy no such official relation to the Church, and have no such supervisory responsibility, as had Barnabas, Titus, and Tychicus.

The Disciples, who have copied most of their organic weaknesses from the Baptists, have followed them, especially in their views of extreme independency, and have manifested even less efficiency in their co-operative movements for benevolent purposes. Fearing a

hierarchy also, they have not attained to the anti-papal office of the evangelist. Not being sure that the evangelist has any *office* in the Church, they have created a new set of officers, and called them *corresponding secretaries*—a name certainly unknown in the Scriptures. Still, this was *their* resort to meet the irrepressible want of an itinerant and somewhat supervisory ministry. This want, like Banquo's ghost, "will not down;" but has asserted itself, in some way, in every modern Church, whatever their views of independency. It is the loss of the evangelist's office that made corresponding secretaries necessary. The primitive Church, in her normal organization, was "thoroughly furnished to every good work." All her general workers were as much a part of regular Church organization as were the local workers; her general assemblies were as well authorized, and as normal, as were their local meetings on the first day of the week. They needed no special dispensation to hold a missionary convention, or to make a division of ministerial labor—some to the circumcision, some to the uncircumcision. They had all missionary arrangements inherent in the organization; but, ever since the Church dropped all but local officers, she has been compelled to mend the breach by creating officers never named, and unknown in primitive times—diocesan bishops, presiding elders, corresponding secretaries, and such like abnormal growths. The Disciples, making it a specialty to search for "the old paths," and to restore the primitive order of things, have been, for several years, looking bravely for the whole truth on this subject, and have found that the early Church had something systematic in the labors of their evangelists. First of all, Jesus sent out the Twelve and the Seventy, "two and two," in such a way that their labors should not be needlessly duplicated in any one place. After the resurrection, it was "first to Jerusalem, *then* Samaria, and *then* to the uttermost parts of the earth." After this, the ministry met in Jerusalem, and arranged that some should go to the circumcision, and some to the uncircumcision. Besides, we are told that they visited all the Churches "in order," confirming the souls of the disciples, and teaching those things that pertain to the kingdom of God. Their whole plan of having "a care of all the Churches," and of "setting in order the things that are wanting," not only makes manifest the unreasonable notion that local officers complete the organization of the Church, but shows that *system* pervaded

their methods of general operation. The modern Disciples, seeing this, assembled in 1869, "with one accord in one place," and made arrangements for general, State, and district evangelic labor, on principles which, if carried out, will lead them fully into the ancient order of spreading the gospel, and "caring for all the Churches." This is a long reach back into primitive times, feeling after apostolic usage. The aim is both to avoid the Prelacy, and at the same time to secure the regular services of a Scriptural itinerant ministry.

But, in one particular, their views are so defective that it may yet prove fatal to a full restoration of this element of success among them. The Church, as a whole, are by no means convinced that an evangelist is an *officer* in the Church, in the sense that an elder is an officer. Their ideas are no little confused as to his real position in the Church. He is not a deacon, not an elder, and yet not a successor to Timothy and Titus; and, as these three classes are all that are recognized in the New Testament, the evangelists of our day have no predecessors, and of course no Scripture authority for their work, or even for their existence. They are neither officers nor privates in the hosts of the Lord, and are often heard inquiring for their real status in the Church. All preachers should be regarded, either as local officers (as pastor, elder, or bishop, of a single congregation), or as evangelists, of wider range of labor. The one labors for the general interests of an individual Church; the other for the general interests of several Churches, or of a district. But these latter, even when elected by the Churches of a whole State, are regarded as mere temporary expedients—mere agents, for whose appointment there is no Scripture authority. To retire the eldership, permanently, from the whole body, would be regarded as at least a partial disruption of Church organization; but to retire every evangelist now in the field, permanently, although a great misfortune, would not be considered, by the Disciples, as the least infraction of said organization. No law on organization would be violated. The whole Presbytery system proceeds to govern this "*Holy Nation*" by municipal authorities alone. It assumes that the Christians of a town have a Divine right to elect their public servants, but that the Christians of a State or district have no *constitutional* right to have a public *officer* at all.

The fear of ecclesiastical power that might grow out of the practical adoption, of the views here advocated, forms the chief objection

to them. But we have before shown the impossibility of this, unless the office be perverted, as any office may be. God's plan is to confer power for doing good, and then hold us responsible for its proper use. The power to do good always implies, and necessarily involves, the power to do evil. God gave us tongues that can curse, and hearts that can hate, elders that can "lord it," and evangelists that could abuse their trust; but holds all responsible for the right use of their powers. The Pope is an overgrown bishop, or elder, and not an overgrown evangelist; and yet the danger of a Pope growing right up out of the elder's office, and the fact foreseen, did not prevent the Savior from creating the office. The thing itself being right, supplemented and guarded by the office of the evangelist (which he will no doubt yet restore), could not be ignored on account of the danger there might be in it. There is *danger* in every thing. It is dangerous to be born, because it were better for some men never to have been born; it is dangerous to get married, dangerous to have a soul, and dangerous, even, to hear the gospel of salvation. If no measures are ever adopted for doing good except those that can not be turned into engines of evil, our good works at once will come to an end.

The unsettled part of this question may all be summed up, theoretically and practically, as follows:

1. *Do the Scriptures recognize no officer of wider field of labor and superintending care than those of the elder?* If the answer to this be negative, how are the considerations above cited to be met? If affirmative, what is the official designation of such field-officer, and what are his duties?

2. If it be found that the present unofficial and half-recognized status of evangelists keeps incomplete the organization of the Church of Christ, will they, as a people, ever move for the restoration of this element of original Christianity, placing the necessity for official status of deacons, elders, and evangelists, all upon the same plane, and as parts of the same organization?

If all the good sought for by both Prelacy and Presbytery—namely, superintendence with independence—can be secured by a restoration of the lost office, and if the missionary inefficiency of the one, and the ecclesiastical tyranny of the other, can be avoided by the same means, a strong presumption is involved in favor of the position herein maintained; and the religious body that is not so organ-

ized should at once consider the practical application of these principles. Not only should those evangelists who now have regular supervision of two or more Churches be recognized in their true official relation in the kingdom, but those also who are elected by the Churches of a State or district for general service. These should be solemnly set apart by fasting, prayer, and the imposition of hands, and so be "recommended to the grace of God" for the work to which they humbly commit their consecrated lives. If these things be true, let the cowards keep still, and the brave speak out. Whoever can be intimidated by fear of the party lash, when the truth and the weal of the Church are at stake, is unfit for a leader among the hosts of God. Strike for the truth, and fear not. None but bigots have discovered every truth in theology. We should not be afraid of finding another, nor ashamed to acknowledge ourselves but learners in the school of Christ. And should the Bible compel us to add as much to our present stock of knowledge as would complete the organization of the Church, we should cherish no regrets. That such completion is imperatively demanded by a lagging missionary cause, by the condition of thousands of perishing, uncared-for Churches, and by many other sadly neglected interests of truth, will one day be patent to all. But this will require an admission of the possible incompleteness of our knowledge of New Testament Church polity, a reinvestigation of the whole question, and a resolution to accept the truth, whatever changes in our Church organization may be involved. No other course is worthy of a people professing to be looking for "the old paths." But if truth is ignored or rejected because it contravenes the imperfect views embraced in other years, a stunted growth, a sect existence, and an unworthy end will mark the terminus of a grand beginning made by broader minds and nobler hearts than ours.

But it is to be distinctly understood that the class of men to fill the office of evangelist, as here contended for, would embrace the most pious, most learned, and most influential in the Church. No reference is had to such young or inefficient men as we have often been compelled to accept as district evangelists, whose lack either of years or of personal influence wholly disqualifies them to fill the place of Barnabas, but the strong men of the Church, who are known and read of all, should be taken from their confinement as city pastors,

and sent out even to the frontiers of the kingdom of God. Let other brethren, of equal piety and industry, though of less pulpit ability, take their places as pastors, as the best possible distribution of forces the Church has at command. Such was the policy of the early Church. Their great generals were in the field, not in the forts. Paul and Barnabas were men of leading ability and position in the Church; and Peter himself, as an itinerant, "*passing through all quarters*," came to Lydda, and such was his power among them that "all that dwelt in Lydda and Saron turned to the Lord." The strongest men of those days often met in counsel, planned their campaigns, gave each other the right-hand of fellowship, and started for the front to give direction to the hosts of God, and to fortify the lines wherever they were weak or faltering. But modern policy has changed all this. We put our mightiest generals in charge of little forts, with a few hundred under them, and send our captains and colonels to the field. Has not the time fully come when that people who are desirous of restoring "the ancient order of things" should, at least, suspect deficiencies in their Church organization, and be independent enough to correct them? They should not be afraid to trust the New Testament, whose teachings lead both to the independence of the Churches and to a healthy supervision of all their affairs lying beyond the jurisdiction of their local authorities. The value of the effort to return to primitive Christianity is too great, and its adaptation to the wants of the age too evident, to allow any hinderance to lie in the way of its success, that can be removed by a candid review of our position, and an honest acceptance of whatever additional truth may be found in the Oracles of God.



## II.—THE RELATIONS OF THE PATRIARCHAL AND JEWISH WORLD TO THE MESSIAH.

THE three great religions of the Bible are Patriarchy, Judaism, and Christianity—the religion of the family; the religion of the State, or nation; the religion of the world. Each of these religions is based on one great fundamental truth. Patriarchy was a standing protest against atheism. It constantly asserted the existence of God. Judaism was a standing protest against polytheism. It constantly asserted the unity of God. It was added to counteract the polytheistic tendency of the race, until the promised Deliverer should come. Christianity takes for granted the existence and unity of God, the fundamental truths of the older religions, and takes for its great distinctive truth the Divine Sonship of the Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth. “The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the Only Begotten of the Father.” The fundamental truths of the two older religions are never attempted to be proved. The sacred writers constantly treat them as intuitional truths, that need not be proved; truths that carry their own self-evidence with them; truths that none but a fool or thoughtless person would deny; truths, although unuttered, yet declared, by day and by night, by the heavens above and the earth beneath. “The heavens declare the glory of God, and the ethereal expanse showeth his handiwork; day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is neither speech nor language; their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their utterances to the end of the world.” “For the invisible things of God, even his eternal power and divinity, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made.” The fundamental truth of Christianity, on the other hand, had to be revealed, and then to be demonstrated. The Divine element alone was found in the older religions; the Divine and the human are combined in the new. The early religions were adapted to a state of minority; the later religion was intended for a state of majority. The older religions abounded in promises;

the new religion was, and is, the fulfillment of all these promises. The old religions were adapted to an imperfect humanity; Christianity was, and is, adapted to humanity in all its possibilities. Patriarchy and Judaism are founded in authority; Christianity, in grace. The two former, in law; the latter, in faith.

The name of the patriarch Abraham comes up from the depths of the ages, leaning, as it were, upon the name of the one living and true God. They seem to be inseparably associated. "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; this is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations." Such men as the Baron Bunsen and Max Müller assure us that to this patriarch, we of to-day are indebted for the great idea of one living and true God, which lies at the foundation of all the religions of the world. His heirship to a world unseen—to "a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God"—only becomes brighter and clearer as the centuries roll on. And this character and heirship the patriarch gained by his faith.

The faith of the ancients was not the faith of the Christ—that faith of which Jesus is declared to be the author and finisher, in the twelfth chapter of the Hebrew letter. This faith, for the best of reasons, they could not have. The mystery of God, which was the subject-matter of the faith of Jesus, was hidden from the ages and generations, and from the patriarchs who lived in those ages and generations as well. Their faith was in God, and in his promises; they looked for a Redeemer. They lived as seeing the Invisible One. They desired to see what the apostles saw, but saw it not; to hear what the apostles heard, but heard it not. They were influenced by an unwavering belief—by an abiding confidence—in every word and promise of the Most High. It mattered not how deep the darkness might be; how impenetrable the shadows that veiled the purposes of the Eternal; how utterly unable they might be to see the end Jehovah had in his view,—they still believed, and still obeyed, and by so doing gained everlasting fame.

There is an important fact mentioned by the apostle, in the last verse of the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, that has constantly been overlooked by interpreters. The apostle says that these men of faith "did not receive the promise;" in other words, did not enter into the enjoyment of the blessings promised. The promise was made to

them; but where would have been the need of a promise if they, by their faith, or in any other way, had been in the enjoyment of the thing promised? And where the need for the oath of God for the confirmation of the promise? The overlooking of this fact has led to some sad mistakes in the Church. The actual condition of the ancient world has not been, and is not now, understood with respect to the Divine administration. Church identity, involving identity of conditions and relations, with only the difference of dispensations, has been, and is to-day, confidently maintained; and only for the reason that men have not noticed that the ancients "did not receive the promise" during their mortal lives.

That the promise which the apostle says "they did not receive" is the promise concerning the Messiah, is not to be doubted,—the promise made to the father and mother of the race in Paradise; subsequently made to Abraham, and confirmed to him and to his posterity, to the world, by the oath of God; the greatest promise *ever made*, and confirmed by the *highest* sanction; involving the greatest interests, the best interests of time and eternity, the forgiveness of sins, life, and incorruptibility; in a word, all that was obtained for the world by the incarnation, life, sufferings, death, resurrection, and glorification of the Son of God—not one of which blessings came to the enjoyment of one of those ancient worthies, as is clearly implied in the apostle's declaration, "They received not the promise."

It is of the first importance, in any attempt to show the relations in which the ancients stood to the Messiah, to distinguish between a promise and the *thing* promised. In the very nature of things, it is impossible for a promise and the thing promised to be synchronous. To Abraham, and other ante-Messianic personages, the promise was made. But if they were already in the full enjoyment of all the Messianic blessings, then what need was there for a promise? Indeed, where was the room for one? God, instead of going into all the formalities of a promise, as plainly set forth in the Holy Scriptures, would have directed their attention to the fact, if they had not been already aware of its presence. But there are other difficulties attending the notion that the old saints were, during their mortal life, in the enjoyment of all the blessings of the gospel. How could it ever have been shown that there was any need for the subsequent advent of the Messiah, if all the benefits of that advent were

already matter of human enjoyment? And more: if this had been really the state of the case, the whole life and public ministry of Jesus of Nazareth, as brought to view in the evangelical records, was one of the most remarkable, and, at the same time, one of the emptiest pageants that ever passed before the eyes of mortals. And not only empty, but for refinement of cruelty—supposing him to have been delivered by the “determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God”—his sufferings and *death*, for *nothing* (for men were already in full possession of all he suffered and died to obtain), would have had no parallel in the history of human or any other kind of folly. If the ancients were already in possession of the blessings of the promise, how could the apostle say that “Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the confirmation of the promises made to the fathers?” Where was the need of such confirmation, and in such a fearful way? Would not the enjoyment have superseded the promise and confirmation? Were not the patriarchs already in possession of all he lived, agonized, and died for, thousands of years before he was born into the world?

But it may be answered: Does not Jesus say, “Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and he saw it, and was glad?” Does not this settle the question forever against the view you are endeavoring to establish? I answer, it does not. The patriarch did by faith, in the light of the promises, see the day of the Messiah, and doubtless was glad. He was strong in his faith, and glorified God; but “he did not receive the promise.” It may be answered again: Does not the apostle say “that the gospel was preached to Abraham?” and is not this against your thesis? I answer, by no means. The apostle says, “For the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen by faith beforehand, preached the gospel to Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations of the earth be blessed.” This was the gospel in promise; and the identical promise which the apostle says the “patriarch did not receive.” He saw the things promised afar off, and in hope of them lived and died, confessing himself a stranger and a pilgrim on the earth, looking for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and founder is God. And what is true in these respects of Abraham, is true of every worthy mentioned in the eleventh chapter of the Hebrews.

The apostle says that God had before provided some better thing

for us. The thought is, that God, during the Patriarchal Age, and, as it were, in their presence, in the promise made provision for us of some better thing; that they, during their life on earth, could not enjoy without us, but could enjoy with us when we came on the stage. It was in the promise foreshown to them that God was providing a better institution, or order of things, than that under which they were living—an institution based on the very promises God was making to them, and making sure by his oath, by himself. And this purpose of God had respect to the contemplated covenant, arising out of the promise in relation to the land of Canaan, which was made with the posterity of Abraham, when God took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, as well as to patriarchy, or that order of things under which the patriarchs lived.

Indeed, Judaism was a temporary arrangement that lay, as it were, in the bosom of patriarchy. In the language of our apostle, "It was added [to patriarchy, of course, for there was nothing else to add it to] on account of transgression, until the seed should come to whom the promise was made, and was ordained by [or through the ministry of] angels in the hands of a mediator." It was never intended to abolish, or even to modify in the least degree, the patriarchal religion. Its ritual, with the exception of circumcision, was the same; and circumcision was precedent to Judaism. All its peculiar rites were subsequent to the promise made to Abraham concerning the Christ. The promise belongs to patriarchy, and not to Judaism—to Abraham, the uncircumcised patriarch; not to Moses, the circumcised lawgiver of Israel. Circumcision was given to Abraham; but it was given after the promise, in order that the promise might be sure to all the seed—not to that which was of the circumcision only, but to that which was of the uncircumcision also. It belonged to Israel, and not to the world. It was a family rite; it was not a world rite. It was intended to serve a family purpose; namely, to keep the family of Abraham separate from all the rest of the families of the earth, and for most important reasons. There were purposes to be served that could be served in no other way—purposes in which the other families of the earth were quite as much interested as were those to whom the right was given.

It may be truly affirmed that patriarchy was the religion of the world, Divinely ordained, from the fall of man till Christianity was

delivered to the Jews on the day of Pentecost, and to the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, the Roman centurion. Cornelius was a worshiper of the true God, but not according to the Jewish ritual. He was not a proselyte to the Jewish religion, either of righteousness or of the gate. He was a patriarchist in the true sense of that word, and worshiped God acceptably according to that rite, as the whole account of him in the Acts of the Apostles goes to show.

God, from the beginning, had the best interests of the world in view. Nor did he, from the day that sin entered into the world, and death by sin, to the day that Jesus hung upon the cross and died for the sins of the world, do, or order any thing to be done, but with constant respect to those interests. The notion entertained by many, that when he chose the family of Abraham to be his peculiar people, and consented to be their God in a peculiar sense—their civil ruler—he gave up all the rest of the nations of the earth, and forgot them, is without foundation in either Scripture or reason. How could he forget them while his oath-confirmed promise continued registered in the sacred archives of earth and heaven? There is scarcely a page of the Old Testament upon which may not be found a standing refutation of the narrow, dishonorable conceit! The great desire to establish the identity of the Jewish Church, *as it is called*, and the Church of Christ, has not a little subverted this unfortunate view; has, in a fearful degree, obscured the great problem that it is the object of the present discourse to solve; has served to put completely out of human view the great, grand movement of God for the redemption of man.

Both of these religious institutions, however, were imperfect; and for the same and most important reasons. Their sacrifices for sin—which were identical, and continually being offered, from day to day, from month to month, from year to year, and from century to century—were utterly insufficient for the taking away, or remission, of sins. The consciences of the worshipers were entirely beyond their reach. They did not bring a single blessing involved in *the promise*, to the enjoyment of those who offered them; and for the simple reason that, in the nature of things, it was impossible for them to do it. Consequently, that thing was not accomplished by these institutions for the ancient saints that God intended, in his own proper time, to have accomplished. Instead of remission of



sins, in these sacrifices, there was continual remembrance; instead of blotting them out, every sacrifice but re-registered them in heaven. And, besides this, there were sins, quite a number, for which there were no sacrifices provided—in a certain sense, unpardonable sins; sins outside the pale of mercy: murder, unkindness to parents, and contempt for the law and lawgiver. Others might be named. All these were beyond the reach of the sin-offerings of patriarchy and Judaism. But God, in the promise, as he subsequently intimated by one of the prophets, purposed being merciful to the transgressions of the people—to forgive and to forget their sins and iniquities. From all this, it appears to be beyond question that the condition of the ancients was an imperfect condition; and more, that the systems of religion under which they lived were equally imperfect, and consequently unable to perfect those that lived under them.

But why did God adopt such a procedure in relation to our race? This is an important question. Another question of great importance arises: Can we obtain any thing like a satisfactory answer to this question as to the Divine procedure in this matter? We answer, that an answer can certainly be found that will be in accordance with Holy Scripture and reason. We are by no means satisfied to say that God did, in this matter, according to the "good pleasure of his will," when he might have done otherwise, and accomplished his object quite as well. He did as great a work for us, and made as fearful a sacrifice for the purpose of accomplishing it, as it is possible for us to conceive. If less could have been done, and the end have been accomplished as well; if some other course could have been pursued that did not involve the fearful sacrifice that God consented to make, we can not for a moment doubt that God would have acted in the premises, and pursued such a course for the salvation of our race as would have been in perfect accordance with his methods of procedure in other departments of his universe. What philosophers call the law of sufficient cause is undoubtedly a law of the universe; and the fact that it is a law of the universe is a proof of the infinite wisdom of Him who built the universe. We know of no reason, human or divine, why this law should not hold, in all its force, in redemption as well as creation. We come, therefore, to this conclusion: that God pursued just the course that had to be pursued, and did exactly what had to be done, neither more nor less, for the purpose of accom-

plishing the end he had in view. The condition of the race, and the character of humanity, furnish the reason for God's method of procedure in the matter.

The human family, during the early ages of its existence on earth, was held in a kind of pupilage, a state of minority. The apostle Paul clearly recognizes this fact in relation to the Jewish nation in his Galatian letter; and, surely, what may be affirmed in this respect of the posterity of Abraham, may be affirmed of the rest of mankind. Consequently, the race was not prepared for a perfect institution of religion. It had to be educated up to the point. All the relations that man was capable of sustaining to his fellow-man needed to be developed in as high a degree as possible, before a religion that contemplated the performance of all the duties arising out of such relations could be given him. The relations of the individual in the family, in the State, and in the world, had to be established and recognized, before a perfect and perfecting institution could be introduced, in which man's relations to God would be established, and under which they could be maintained. An institution that would answer the Divine purposes for all time subsequent to the time of its introduction, would have to await the development of the possibilities of human nature. To have introduced it before this point was reached by the education of the race, would have been impossible in the nature of things. Its introduction and adaptation to a present humanity would have made it absolutely necessary to change it, and adapt it to any subsequent and higher development of human nature. The Jewish nation had passed away from the religion of Moses, so as to fully justify the declaration of the apostle, that it had grown old, and was ready to vanish away. This is a standing proof of the imperfectness of that institution. The apostle Peter clearly sets forth that it was no longer adapted to the Jewish nation. The rules and regulations of the family, when all its members are in a state of minority, would be found altogether useless and cumbersome when all had become mature men and women, able to take their places in society, and each for himself or herself to perform the part that might be assigned them in the newer and higher relations of life. There was another and most important point to be gained before a perfect institution of religion could be introduced into the world. What may be called the period of authentic history, the fullness of

time, had to come. If a perfect institution had been introduced in patriarchal times, to-day, in accordance with the theory of Strauss and others, it would have ranked only with the fables and myths of a high antiquity. The foundation of a sure faith had to be carefully laid; and to-day, not only the Jewish, but the Christian religion, has all the certainty of authentic history.

The theory of Bauer, that Christianity is the result of a tendency of Jewish monotheism, Greek speculation, and Roman politics, or imperialism, is false; for the reason that Christianity has its foundation in a promise of God, which antedates them all more than a thousand years. To the New Testament, to Jesus of Nazareth, to Christianity, the Jews of these times are indebted for the preservation and authentication of their sacred books and religion. Jews might think this a strange declaration; but it is capable of the most satisfactory proof. Nor is this all. To Jesus and his apostles is to be referred the elevation of the writings of the greatest of ancient lawgivers and the noblest of ancient prophets to the level of veritable history. And it is a noteworthy fact that the discoveries of Layard, Rawlinson, Wilson, and others, are fully corroborating the testimonies of the Great Teacher and his disciples touching the historical reliability of these ancient records.

In the days of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the *family* was the highest notion of a human government—the very terms of the promise made to the patriarch, “In thee, and in thy seed, shall all the *families* of the earth be blessed.” When God said, “I will make of thee a great nation,” the conception was nothing more than a great *family*. Any thing like a nationality, such as we understand it—a State, such, for example, as the Roman Empire—was yet to be seen. The nationalities of those days, as well as of the following five hundred years, were in no sense of the word such nationalities as we are in the habit of thinking and speaking about. Five hundred years after the days of Abraham, Joshua overthrew thirty kingdoms in the land of promise. A country not more than one hundred miles in width by one hundred and eighty or two hundred miles in length—a walled city, or a fortress, with a few suburban residences, with a small region of country for the pasturage of flocks—made a kingdom. These facts appear strange to us; but they go far to prove two things that have not been observed: first, the antiquity of the writ-

ings in which they are found; and, second, the near approach of those times to the origin of the race. These were just such nationalities as we should expect to find in the early years of the human race. The population of the patriarchal world, as indicated in the Bible, is a wonderfully significant fact—a fact that might considerably assist Sir John Lubbock and Sir Charles Lyell in their recent efforts to prove the almost eternal existence of man on the earth. How very far they must have been from any state of things of which we of to-day have any idea! How very imperfect their civil establishments must have been! Any thing like national relationships or laws of nations, to them were utterly unknown. Written laws, antecedently to the laws of Moses, did not exist, that we know of. The *lex non scripta* in the mind of the head of the *family* was the law of humanity. In those days, five kings, whose kingdoms were situated around the Salt Sea, entered into some sort of alliance to resist the forces of four eastern kings who came against them. The five were conquered by the four, their citizens taken into captivity, and their cities plundered; after which, the conquerors departed. The patriarch Abraham, being informed by one who escaped from the defeat, of the results, pursued the victors with three hundred and eighteen trained servants. He overtook them, and defeated them in turn, recovering all the captives and spoils, and restored them to the vanquished kings. Egypt, the first among the ancient nationalities, in the day of the great patriarch was at the zenith of its power and glory. It was made up of a series of petty patriarchates, situate on the banks of the Nile from the Great Sea to the falls of the Great River, all grouped together in one great patriarchate—the people the children of one great father; or, rather, the slaves of one great despot. This condition of the inhabitants of that fruitful country accounts for the existence of the pyramids, sphinxes, and other marvelous monuments of human folly, that kingdoms and empires of our day, ten times, a hundred times as populous, could not erect.

A world in such a state as this that we have been endeavoring to describe was certainly in no condition to appreciate, to understand, to use, or to profit by, such a religious institution as that contemplated in the promise made to Abraham. All that could be done was just what God is said to have done in the Holy Scriptures—make promise, and then place the people under tutors and

governors until the time appointed by the Father, or until they were prepared, in some degree, to receive and profit by what God promised to do for them. Moses was first put in possession of all the wisdom of Egypt, and then appointed to instruct Israel; and Israel had to instruct the world. From the day that Joseph became a premier of Egypt to the day of Jesus of Nazareth, there was no court or kingdom—Chaldean, Assyrian, Median, Persian, Grecian, or Roman—in which a descendant of him to whom the promise was made was not to be found fulfilling his God-appointed task. Who has not read the story of the little captive girl in the court of the King of Assyria, at Damascus—true to her mission, as Joseph was in the court of the King of Egypt; as Daniel was in the courts of the Kings of Chaldea, Media, and Persia—teaching the great lesson in modest, childish phrase: the lesson she had learned from her great ancestor, in relation to the one living and true God: "Would to God that my master were with the prophet of God in Samaria, for then he would heal him of his leprosy?"

Nor were these the only instrumentalities that were being employed during those long ages and centuries, in the providence of God, for the purpose of educating mankind, and preparing the way to introduce the order of things that was to deliver the race from the reign of sin and death. Messages were sent to nations that were afar off. Sometimes the prophets were sent in person. Besides this, God had not left himself without witness among the nations. The eternal power and divinity of God were clearly to be seen in the light of the things he had made, so that the nations might be without excuse. Family, tribal, and national boundaries had been settled in such a way by the Most High as to induce men to seek after him, and find him. Greek and Roman poets had not a little awakened the desire for the coming of the Deliverer of the world. Grecian speculation, in the providence of God, served an important object. Roman imperialism consolidated the humanities—made one world out of all the known nationalities of earth, and supplemented the Jewish institution in the development of a system of jurisprudence. And to show that we are not mistaken in our estimate of the value of these last-named instrumentalities, it will be only necessary to state one great historical fact; namely, that the nations that had been under Grecian and Roman culture furnished the fields for the

grandest conquests of our holy religion. These were the nations best prepared to receive and enjoy the benefits of the promise.

Moses, toward the close of his life, informed Israel that there were better things in store for them in the Divine purpose than he had given them; and Jesus gives the reason why it was so: "On account of the hardness of your hearts,"—the want of proper culture. They were still children. The prophets foretold the bringing in of a better order of things than that under which they lived. Indeed, these holy men sometimes became so filled with the glory of the coming-reign of God on earth, that they seem to have forgotten the institution under which they were living. They speak sometimes disparagingly of the sacrifices of Judaism. They foresaw a brighter day, a better covenant—the reign of God. They predicted the coming of the Righteous One, the sufferings of the Messiah, the following glory. And every prediction that they uttered was not only a standing proof that the sacrifices and other rites of patriarchy and Judaism were imperfect; but, besides this, it was a proof that these prophets and ancient saints of God were themselves conscious of the imperfection. And hence their longing for the Messiah; hence the value of their faith. It was, with them, faith against fact; it was faith against hope—to believe in hope that they might receive the promise. From Abel to John the Baptist, from Moses to Jesus of Nazareth, this state of imperfection existed. Nor could it be otherwise. The difficulty was not in God; it was in the condition of humanity. It was a real condition—a condition that could not be changed in a moment, without doing a violence to the moral and intellectual constitution of man that was not in the purpose of his Creator. God proposed to save man *as man*, and not as something else. He did not propose to reconstitute him. He intended to save his moral nature, and to preserve unchanged his capacity for moral government. He intended that man should be as free as the angels around his eternal throne; that man should not only be saved, but be worth saving. He purposed taking that being, into whose nostrils he had breathed the breath of life, and to make him a companion of those first-born sons of light who joined the morning stars in the song of creation. In a word, he proposed to do every thing for man that was worthy of himself, and nothing that was unworthy of man. Although man was a sinner, darkly



stained with transgression, under the power of the great enemy of God and man, it was in the Divine purpose to deliver him into the glorious liberty of the sons of God. To have unveiled these grand designs before the ancient world, would have served a less purpose, indeed, than for the greatest and noblest conqueror that ever appeared among the sons of men to have unfolded all his designs and purposes of conquest and empire to the babes of his household.

The veiling of the face of Moses was not intended to hinder the children of Israel from seeing into the end of that which was to be abolished on account of its imperfectness, but rather to indicate that they, at that time, were unable to see the design or end of the institution he was delivering to them. And if they were unable to see into the end or design of that institution, how much less able to receive the great and perfect institution contemplated by God in the promise made to Abraham?

This protracted examination of the condition of the ancient world has been instituted for the purpose of finding an answer to the question, "Why did God adopt such a procedure in relation to our race" in the beginning of things? And we think it must be clear that the reason for the Divine procedure will be found, not in the "good pleasure of his will," or that he did for his glory as he pleased, when he could have done otherwise as well, but rather in the condition of the race. There was an actual necessity in the case. True, however, it is, that it was his good pleasure to undertake to save us.

The word "perfect" frequently occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the first seven chapters it is constantly used in relation to the Son of God. In this connection it signifies the qualification of our Lord Jesus Christ by means of his incarnation, life, sufferings, and death, to be the great High-priest of the human race. It is a notable fact that our Lord, while he lived on earth, never intimated that he was a priest, or even that he was to be a priest. It is further notable that this Epistle to the Hebrews is the only document in the New Testament in which his relations to priesthood are first and last stated and defended. In the first seven chapters this matter is discussed. The subject divides itself into two parts. The first part begins with the Epistle, and ends with the fifth chapter. The second part begins with the sixth chapter, and ends with the

seventh. In the first part, the apostle considers the supreme dignity of the Lord Jesus Christ: First, as the Son of God; and, second, as priest in things pertaining to God. In the second part—leaving the discourse of the headship of Christ as finished in the first part—he proposes to go on to consider him in his perfected relations to the human race, as the apostle and high-priest of our profession, constituted such by the oath of God and the power of an endless life. It may appear to some almost profane to talk about “perfecting” the Son of God. The difficulty will disappear, however, when we state that it is a question of office, and not of nature, that the sacred writer is considering in these chapters. He was, as to his nature, perfectly divine, and as perfectly human as he was divine. In these respects he needed nothing. But in order that, as man, he might be a high-priest for men in things pertaining to God, it was necessary for him to be perfected through human sufferings. And until there was such a perfected priest over the house of God, the perfection of humanity was impossible. The apostle brings all these matters into a very clear light in the first part of this Epistle.

From the beginning of the eighth chapter to the end of the twelfth, he ceases to speak of priesthood, and of perfection in relation to it, and uses the term in relation to men. He uses it for purification of conscience, for forgiveness of sins; and this forgiveness so complete that the subject of it, once so purified as to the conscience, once so forgiven, will have no more conscience of sins, will have a conscience void of offense toward God and toward men. We are not to understand this as placing the subject of it in a state of sinless perfection, or beyond the power of sinning, as some have vainly taught, and calling such an imagination a state of sanctification—a meaning of the word *sanctification* unknown in the Oracles of God. Nor yet are we to understand that such persons, if they should sin, as they have the power to do, would be unconscious of it. This would only be absurd. We are to understand that those who are thus perfected have no more conscience of sins of which they have been acquitted, a conscience no more defiled with sins that have been forgiven. Such an acquittal could obtain only on two conditions: First, a perfect priest—perfected with respect to all the conditions of humanity that needed his help, perfected by sufferings, and endowed with an endless life; second, a perfect offering for sin—an offering that, being once made

and presented by the perfected priest, would need never to be repeated; but, after the manner of the priest, who abides a priest perpetually, would be perpetual in its efficacy for the forgiveness of sin. A perfect priest—a perfect offering—a perfect remission! Such a priest, such an offering, the ancients had not; and, consequently, such a remission they enjoyed not. These were among the things hidden in God from the ages and generations. And so completely were they concealed in God, who made all things by Jesus Christ, that they were not objects of ancient faith in any sense of the word. Consequently, the blessings involved in them were entirely beyond the reach of the ancients. It was in the purpose of God to perfect them in this respect, however. Of this, intimation is given in the prophets. "I will be merciful to their transgressions, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." The remembrance of sins was to cease. This was to be accomplished by the taking away of sin-offering in the daily sacrifices, and the bringing in of perpetual righteousness. But in all these prophetic promises, there is not the shadow of an intimation of the way in which God intended to fulfill them. Eye saw not; ear heard not; into the heart of patriarch, priest, prophet, or king, the idea of a perfect priest and perfect offering for sin entered not. The promise made to Abraham belonged to the Christ, and all that was in it the Christ was to reveal. Types and shadows were afforded; but the antitypes and substances were as completely concealed from the world as was the glory of the Eternal on Mount Sinai from Israel in the plain at the foot of the mountain. There was no revelation of the matter of the great promise until the Christ made it. It is needful to detain a little here, for the reason that no consistent, well-defined views of these great matters are entertained. There are few that can give any very satisfactory account of the course and character of the Divine proceedings in relation to the human race.

"Their iniquities I will remember no more." This prophetic promise had respect to the iniquities of the ancients as well as to our sins. The sins of the patriarchs and prophets, whether under patriarchy or Judaism, were kept in constant memory by every victim that bled on every altar, from Abel to the Christ. The sacrifices were God's remembrancers of sin. And he remembered them only for reason that they were not forgiven. But he promises to forgive and

to forget. And if God so forgives and forgets, those forgiven need have no more conscience of them; but will be perfected as it respects the conscience. Such persons need entertain no fears of the penalty due to sin; for the forgiveness of sin is the remission of its penalty. This is the perfect forgiveness secured by a perfect priest, with a perfect offering. We are not to understand that this perfection is the perfection of a future life, and of which we all hope to be made partakers when we are finally presented to God. It is a perfection to be enjoyed now and here. It is to be enjoyed antecedently to the resurrection from the dead, by all who desire to be made partakers of future perfect being and happiness. All actual transgressors must be thus forgiven, or never enter heaven. Those that are not guilty of actual transgression have no need of this provision of Divine mercy in relation to sin. If such die before they become actual transgressors, the provisions made and finished by the death and resurrection of the Messiah are ample to secure to them a future glorious immortality. The dogma of original sin is without authority of the Word of God. No sacrifice was appointed for it, or even mention made of it with Divine approval, during all the ages of patriarchy or Judaism. Nor is it to be legitimately inferred from any thing said in all the oracles of God.

This perfection belongs to the present state of things—the present life, under the administration of the Messiah. And he being constituted Lord of all—of the dead as well as of the living—so soon as he appeared in the heavenly Holy of Holies with his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption, the transgressions of the ancients, under the first covenant, were redeemed, and the called admitted to the enjoyment of the promise of eternal inheritance. They were perfected then and there by Jesus, notwithstanding that they had lived and died, some of them, thousands of years before the Deliverer visited this world. Thus Jesus becomes the Savior of all; not of the living only, but of the dead as well. Christ both died and rose, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living. And, as such Lord, he is ready to judge the living and dead. Every redeemed son or daughter of Adam—from the first man to the last, from Adam to the resurrection from the dead—standing before the eternal throne, will see, in the glorified Son of man and Son of God, the Redeemer of the race, the Elder Brother of our humanity, the

first-born among many brethren—the first-born from the dead. This is the purpose of the Eternal, and it shall stand as surely as his throne. Whom God heretofore recognized, he also heretofore pointed out to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he heretofore pointed out to be conformed to the image of his Son, he called. The called, by the redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant, received the promise of the eternal inheritance. Whom he called, he thus justified—placed upon the same footing with us, or perfected with us. Whom he justified, he also glorified.

The great difficulty that commentators and interpreters have encountered in Hebrews xi, 39, 40, becomes plain: "That they," the ancients, "without us should not be made perfect." What this can mean, has been a very perplexing question. Translators translate by the *word*. They seem to have had no idea of what the apostle meant. The commentators resort to methods of interpretation that only prove that they felt themselves surrounded by impenetrable darkness. Their theologies, to some extent, and their failure to keep in view the relations of the different parts of the Divine procedure, may be regarded as the cause of their difficulty. Stewart seems to have gotten a glimpse of the idea; and he is the only one known to me. Bloomfield follows Stewart, without adding a thought. Stewart says, "That the death of Christ had a retrospective efficacy, is plain from the ix, 15, of this Epistle, compared with Romans iii, 25, *sq.*" This is substantially all that he says. It is perhaps enough. Whether the learned translator and commentator would have been willing to admit all the consequences necessarily involved in this most important statement may be questioned. For example: Does he mean that righteous Abel, who offered to God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, and was therefore accepted, God attesting his gifts; that Noah, who prepared an ark, at the instance of God, for the saving of his house from the waters of the Flood, thus condemning the world, and, by so doing, becoming heir of the righteousness, which is by faith,—never were pardoned or perfected as it respects the conscience, until Christ, the great High-priest, appeared in the presence of God, not with the blood of bulls and of goats, but with his own blood? Does he mean that Abraham, whose faith was counted to him for righteousness, and to whom the promises were made with Isaac and

Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise, lived and died without being acquitted of their sins, or pardoned? What he says can mean no less than this. The death of Christ was only with reference to sin, and for sin. The remission of sin was its prime, indeed its only, object. To this, then, its retrospective efficacy must amount, or it amounts to nothing at all. It matters not whether the efficacy reaches the sins through the sacrifices that they offered, or directly, without their intervention; in either case, there was clearly no remission until the blood of Jesus was present in the true tabernacle. It is probable that the learned and noble-spirited professor would have hesitated to grant all these startling consequences which arise so legitimately out of his own statement. His Church of circumcised and uncircumcised patriarchs (none of the patriarchs were circumcised before Abraham), with their circumcised and uncircumcised children—the parents unforgiven of one sin, and the little ones unprovided for, as it respects a future life; death reigning with undisputed power over the entire race; in a word, a Church in which there was not a single member, from the least to the greatest, in the enjoyment of one blessing involved in the great promise—would certainly have amounted to nothing like the Church that God intended to set up in the world. The fact is, patriarchy contemplated nothing like a Church; and Judaism contemplated a national establishment, and not a Church, in the Christian sense of that word. The time had not come for God to call out a people and put his name upon them, admitting the same time to the enjoyment of Divine spiritual blessings and privileges. The world was not ready for that yet. The new way of life was not yet open; and this could only be done through the flesh of the Messiah. We insist upon it, that Professor Stewart's statement, with all its consequences, is to be received without the shadow of a doubt as to its correctness.

The apostle says, "The law perfected nothing," not even its priests; how much less its worshipers! Neither did patriarchy. He says again: "That the law having a shadow of good things to come"—mark it, "*to come*"—"and not the image of the things, can never, with the same sacrifices which they offer from year to year continually, make them who offered them perfect. For then would not those offerings have ceased to be offered? because the worshipers having been once purged should have had no more conscience of sins."



But by, or in, those sacrifices, there is a remembrance of sins from year to year; for it is impossible for the blood of bulls and of goats to take away sins. In many other places he speaks of those constantly repeated sacrifices as being insufficient for the remission of sins. In view of all this, we are constrained to the conclusion that the ancients—by which we mean all those who lived under patriarchy and Judaism—having only sacrifices that were imperfect, were themselves imperfect, and died without being perfected as it respects the conscience—died without coming to the enjoyment of the forgiveness of sins, which we enjoy under the reign of the Messiah. If they had been perfected in this respect while they lived, then they would have been perfected without *us*; and this the apostle denies.

The question, then, will be asked: To what end were the sacrifices of patriarchy and Judaism ordained? what purpose did they serve? These are important questions; and especially in this our day, when there are those who are trying to make it appear that they were merely human contrivances, without the sanction of Divine authority. God, perhaps, permitted them to continue, in deference to human weakness and folly; but, so far as he was concerned, set no value upon them. We think differently. A purpose Divinely wise and good was served by them.

The father of a rising family, who is deeply interested in their present and future welfare, does not abandon them during their minority. He continues with them, and near them, to train them and prepare them for their majority. He adapts himself to their limited views and powers. There will be many things done, and ordered to be done, that the children will not understand—things that would neither be done or ordered were the children full-grown men and women: nothing, however, if the father be a wise and good man, that will not have relation to the future places and duties that he may desire his children to fill and discharge in mature life. This, in a small degree, illustrates the method of the Divine procedure in relation to the human race.

It is a remark of Grotius, that "that which is first in intention is always last in execution." Man, so far as this world is concerned, was certainly first in the Divine intention; he was, however, the last of all earthly creatures made. In his creation, that which was first in God's intention was, that man might glorify God and enjoy him

forever—an intention, as we think, clearly indicated in man's mental and moral constitution, and well worthy of his Creator. And it will be seen, as we believe, that every step in the Divine procedure, from the day that man was created to the day that the Messiah died on the cross, was a part of a series of transactions eminently calculated to reach that grand first intention. If the devout scientist can find, in the lower strata of the earth's crust, forms of life and arrangements of inorganic matter predictive of the coming of man, we do think that we can find in the arrangements of patriarchy and Judaism predictions of the coming of one greater man, the object of whose coming would be to finish the mystery of God by the elevation of man to that glory that was in the intention of the Eternal when he created him. And it might well be anticipated that, in so grand a consummation, Divine agencies would play a most conspicuous part.

The introduction of sin into the world, and death by sin, made it necessary for somewhat to be done that would indicate the full recognition of the fact, and, at the same time, look to a remedy. Sacrifice was instituted. In this, the two points were fully secured. That human wisdom, in its highest development, would have adopted such an expedient may well be doubted. The fitness of it, however, commends itself to the highest development of that reason. It was eminently suggestive of the condition of humanity, and at the same time pointed to a remedy. "We thus judge," says our apostle, "that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they who henceforth live should not live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them, and rose again.

In an important sense, the sacrifices of patriarchy and Judaism were typical of the sacrifice of the Messiah. The sins for which they were offered, and which they constantly brought to remembrance, were brought into such relation with the sacrifice of the Son of God, that so soon as it was offered all such sins were redeemed—but not before—and the worshipers admitted to the enjoyment of the promise of eternal inheritance. If such sins had been redeemed before, then there could have been no remembrance of them; and if there were no remembrance of them, then these sacrifices were without any significance; and, not only so, the sacrifice of the Messiah was of no use, so far as these sins were concerned. But it is not to be supposed for a moment that they were not of use. The

sins of the ancient saints were brought forward, so to speak, by them to the redemption obtained by our Lord Jesus Christ; and by their redemption the ancients were perfected with us, but not without us, as would have been the case if they had been perfected before the one perfect offering of Jesus was made. It is true that they were dead, and some of them thousands of years, when the Christ appeared to make an end of sin, or to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself; but their *spirits* were perfected by his death. Their transgressions were redeemed by his blood, and to-day we stand associated with the general assembly and Church of the First-born, whose names are registered in heaven—with the spirits of just men made perfect by the blood of sprinkling that speaks better things than the blood of Abel, the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the great day of God Almighty, all alike—whether ancients or moderns; patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs; or the Christians of the present or any future generation—will see, in him who bore our sins in his own body on the tree, *him* to whom all are indebted for wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption; and in him, and him alone, in that great day, shall all the seed of Israel glory. In that great day, the saved of every clime and age will meet around the great white throne, and join in the glorious psalm: "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing; for thou hast redeemed us out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign with thee upon the earth." To Jesus we are—*all are*—and shall be evermore, indebted for all. And in honoring him we shall honor the Father who sent him. For the Father hath sworn that to Jesus every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess. The decree has gone forth that he is universal Lord, and that the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever.

We are prepared, now, to submit a paraphrase of the passage several times referred to in this paper (Heb. xi, 39, 40): "And all these ancient worthies, named or referred to in this passage, having gained a good reputation by faith in the word and promises of God made to them concerning the Messiah, died without receiving the acquittal from their sins involved in the promise, God having before

provided something better for us than what they enjoyed during their mortal life, which was foreshown to them in their sacrifices; namely, that they were to be perfected with respect to the conscience by the sacrifice of the Messiah: but not before us, or without us, but with us." Of course, we endeavor, in this enlarged statement, to set forth what we believe to be certainly involved in one of our apostle's most comprehensive, and, at the same time, one of his most obscure utterances.

We thus see how the sacrifices of patriarchy and Judaism were related to the sacrifice of Christ. We learn the important purposes they served in those ancient dispensations of religion. We see that no victim ever bled on any altar of patriarchy or Judaism, the blood of which did not *seal* the sin or sins for which it was offered for redemption by that better blood which was shed on the cross of Christ. It comes out in this discussion, that the blood of bulls and goats, of lambs, kids, calves, and doves, offered to God by his ancient servants, only registered the sins for which it was offered before the eternal Throne, that they might be blotted out by the blood of the Lamb of God, which takes away the sin of *the world*; and, being blotted out, be forgotten by God *evermore*. In the course of this investigation we perceive how "the *spirits* of just men were made perfect," when they were made perfect, where they were made perfect, by whom they were made perfect, and in what that perfection consists. We have learned the import of Romans viii, 28, 29, 30, especially of that part of the passage in which it is asserted that certain persons were predestinated to be conformed to the image of the Son of God, that so he might be the first-born among many brethren. We have discovered how Jesus is the eldest-born of the family; the first-born from the dead; the head of the body, the Church; the chief; in a word, how it comes to pass that he takes precedence of all. And we strongly suspect that this discussion has thrown some light on that dark passage of the apostle Peter, found in the fourth chapter of his First Epistle, and sixth verse, than which an obscurer passage was never uttered by his brother Paul. And a key to this passage will unlock that other dark utterance of his, found in the preceding chapter, beginning with the eighteenth and ending with the twentieth verse. In this argument we have found an ample refutation of the Sadduceeism of the day of our apostle, as well as of the atheistic

materialism of our own times. Separate spiritual existence is clearly affirmed. Spirits are perfected thousands of years after death by being admitted to the enjoyment of the promise made to Abraham. Such spirits are mentioned as constituting the general assembly and Church of the first-born registered in heaven.

After this imperfect survey of the vast field that has been under review, we only feel how little able we are to set forth the wonderful dealings of God, during the ages and generations, with the sons of men. We can only conclude our humble effort, as we think appropriately, in the language of our apostle, found in the conclusion of a similar survey: "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counselor? or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed to him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen."

---

### III.—FAVORITES OF PREJUDICE.

IN the inquiry after truth, nothing so much interferes with our progress, perhaps, as the fact that we do not want to know the truth; just as in our actions the difficulty is, not that we can not learn the right, but that we do not want to do it. The name that we commonly give to such hinderances to truth and duty is prejudice. But their extent and variety we are little aware of. The cause of them is generally our individual interests, which bias our opinions as they do our actions. If we were disinterested, we would not care how truth should be; and so would accept or reject it on pure evidence, as we do scientific and mathematical truths, which do not very nearly concern our practical life. But in religion, politics, and, above all, in personal matters, these prejudices are in great extent and force.

First, as to religious prejudices. The ways in which religion obstructs us in the search after truth are almost without number. In

the first place, it does not let us inquire into many subjects which we would otherwise inquire into, dogmatics being supposed to have settled them. Thus it prevented, for a long time, all geologic investigations; because, asserting that the world was only six thousand years old, and made at once by the fiat of God, it was thought useless to hunt for fossils of an earlier age, or for a genesis of the world by other means. It has likewise prevented critical inquiries into the evidences of Christianity, into the character of Christ, into the nature of his morals and teaching, and even into the existence of God. It lays down, as a rule, that we must come to all such subjects with our mind made up; that is, that we should accept them on faith, or without investigation; in other words, that we should dismiss our reason before entering on them. And if, from time to time, the learned have, notwithstanding this religious opposition, impiously investigated, and found valuable results therein, the religious leaders, supposing them to be hostile to religion, have for long ages kept the people from accepting them. Religion, too, makes us afraid to venture into many questions, or to venture freely, lest we should find something against it. Some persons, in their zeal for religion, have even opposed the study of mental science and of critical history, just as they have opposed liberal policies in State, and free action in society. The fact is, that we want certain things to be true, and so not only believe them readily, and often without inquiry, but do not allow ourselves to make any inquiries that may invalidate them. We want the doctrine of immortality to be true; we want the restraints which religion imposes to be felt in society; we want morality, purity, and many other things which religion secures: and therefore we do not give evidence its due weight against religion.

In the next place, we have sectarian prejudice, which is still stronger than general religious prejudice, especially in a country and age like ours, where religion is generally accepted. The peculiarities of a sect are as zealously accepted as the truth of religion itself, though on the same lack of evidence. It is a significant fact that nearly every body born a Baptist remains one; and nearly every body born an Episcopalian remains one; and nearly every body born a Catholic remains one; the changes in one's Church relations being of exceedingly rare occurrence, and then often for considerations of respectability, salary, or the like, and not on account of change of opinions. And one is



not only a member of his accidental Church, but generally a zealous combatant for it in all its peculiarities. Every one thinks his own doctrine is the truest, his Church forms the best, its members the most pious, its preachers the most eloquent, its churches the most beautiful, its prospects the most hopeful. A sectarian can not even pass judgment on the quality of a sermon, or the architecture of a building, without knowing to what denomination it belongs. If it is of his own denomination, he magnifies its beauties, screens its defects, and strains his mind to make it appear better than it is, or better than that of some other denomination. A Methodist in London or New York will find the best preachers to be chiefly of his denomination; a Presbyterian of his; and so the rest. A man in whom the religious element is the strongest will find this to apply to all the departments of life. The Baptist thinks the Baptist scientific men are greatest; that the discoveries which they have made are most useful to the world; that the Baptist politicians are most worthy of honor; that the Baptist historical personages are most eminent; that Roger Williams, for example, made the chief epoch in our history; that John Bunyan made an epoch in religion, etc. Among such persons we can not get a sincere opinion on any subject; for every subject is to them in some way remotely connected with their religion. It is true we have liberal men in the Churches, who give all denominations their dues; but they are generally persons who do not care much about religion—who are philanthropic, it may be, rather than religious, and who, though members of Church, have their hearts elsewhere. The sad fact is, that Churchmen, of whatever creed, who make much of a business of religion, see all things in the light of their denomination. I have known Methodists whose only object in reading history seemed to be to know how every body stood in regard to Methodism. About all they know of Macaulay is, that he said that John Wesley had a genius for government not inferior to that of Richelieu. About all they know of General Jackson is his remark, that if he had a hundred officers like Peter Cartwright, he could conquer all England. A Universalist will judge of every body's position according to what he thinks of hell; that constituting, in his mind, his real characteristic and his title to worth. Sir Isaac Newton is known to him, not as a philosopher, but as a Universalist; so Horace Greeley, Hannibal Hamlin, and whoever is illustrious for any thing whatever. The

chance words that fell from the lips or pen of John Wesley, or Dr. Tholuck, which look like hope for the finally impenitent, are taken as the measure of the lives and thoughts of those great men. With such feelings running through one's mind, and such principleless interests showing themselves at every stage of one's thoughts, it is no wonder that we can not conduct a calm discussion, or arrive at a sincere conclusion on a subject. The things, that we want to be true, we will find some pretext to believe to be true; and if we find them to be true, we will love them so much, and think of them so disproportionately, that we can not give any thing else its due importance. Great truths we let slide, that we may expatiate on our favorite ones, however insignificant. I have known a Methodist tourist to look at the plain front of his meeting-house in Waterloo Road longer than at St. Paul's Cathedral; and finally he got himself to think it was equally beautiful,—if not in all respects, yet in some.

The prejudices of country are much the same as those of religion, though there is in our patriotism no principle, as there is in our religion, which forbids us to consider the truth of irreligious propositions, or to push the inquiry in them too far; that is, no principle of faith that requires us to accept things in a certain way without evidence. The prejudices of country are like those of sect, rather than like those of religion as a whole, being not on any principle or acknowledged legitimacy, and not recognized or admitted in ourselves. Neither are due to religion or patriotism, as such, but to a principle of human nature by which we esteem and love what is our own just as we take more interest in it. Every one believes his country the best, the wealthiest, the most promising for the future, and as having the noblest history. In war, he believes her always right, and generally interprets her battles in the light of victory; or, where this is too plainly impossible, of honorable defeat. His country, right or wrong, is practically his motto; and he is willing to fight for it, die for it, lie for it, and deceive himself for it. In fact, he would be thought a poor patriot who should consider calmly his country's claims in comparison with those of other nations, especially in time of war or dispute. How universal this feeling is, may be seen from the fact that, in a war, the citizens are not only all on the side of their country, but think their country right and the enemy wrong. In traveling in another country, one never likes it as well as his own,

either as regards scenery, improvements, people, or customs. In conversation with foreigners, he claims that there are in his own country cities and buildings more beautiful, fruit and vegetables more plentiful, and statesmen and people more intelligent. In short, whenever he compares any thing with any thing, he always puts his prejudices on the side of his country; or, if the facts are too plainly against him, he slips in some other matter in the balance that will turn the scales in his favor. If he must admit that the vegetation of a foreign country is, in general, richer than in his own land, yet his country, he thinks, has at least larger onions, as a Dane once said to me; or raises bigger cattle, as an Englishman will claim. A man can not make a comparison in which his own country comes off the worse, without running off into some matter in which his country is the better. It is true that persons who have traveled are generally known to reverse this disposition when they return, and to relate to their countrymen, who have not traveled, the things which they have seen, as much greater and better than any thing they have at home. But this is only an example of prejudice in favor of self, wherein the narrators differ from their hearers; and it will be mentioned hereafter. But in speaking with foreigners, the same persons will not make admissions detracting from their country. This disposition to look favorably on and praise our country prevents us from forming any thing like a fair judgment of our own or other lands, and from appreciating our merits as well as deprecating our faults. It makes us unphilosophical, unhistorical and unjust; keeps us constantly in wrong opinions and in vicious ways of thinking; and often prevents us from arriving at very important political or scientific truths. It prevents us from reducing politics, nationality, and ethnology, to a science. It is due to this principle that we can not get correct censuses, just populations of cities, estimates of armies, of a nation's wealth and resources, the number of miles of a railroad, ships of commerce, etc. On many points, the people do not want to know the facts. Nobody in Antwerp knows how high the cathedral spire is, and will not measure; the citizens only insist that it is the highest in the world, the authorities varying from three to five hundred feet, according as they are native or foreign. No German wants to know definitely how high the great Pyramid of Cheops is, lest it should prove higher than the Strasbourg spire. In fact, the heights

of none of the great steeples of Europe are known, easy as it would be to get their height by trigonometrical measurement, because every one hopes that the one in his own country is the highest. They accordingly fight for Strasbourg, Vienna, Fribourg, Landshut, St. Peter's, and others, and use all sorts of argument but measurement.

It would seem that we must admit the utter incompatibility of the human race for rational thought on certain subjects. The love of truth gets overpowered by that of something else; and people seek for conclusions according to their desires, rather than according to the facts. We see this still more strongly, perhaps, in the parties of a nation than in the nation itself; party or sectional prejudice being stronger than patriotism, just as bigotry is stronger than religious prejudice. Every one believes that his own party is right, and right in all respects and on all issues. One generally belongs to that political party to which his father belonged, whole families espousing the same cause together, and whole decades of generations, one after another. They learn to hurrah from their childhood, and perhaps never in a life-time do they give a candid thought to any of the questions which divide the several parties. Their minds are shut to all arguments from the opposite side, and eagerly opened to all on their own side, where they have no need of any. They do not commonly admit any of the faults or dishonesties of their own party, or any of the virtues of the opposite party. Sometimes, when by force of special circumstances they get half convinced of truth on the opposite side, they refuse further to consider the matter, lest the truth should be seen to be different from what they hold it to be. One accordingly never knows the true state of his own party, of his own principles, or of his own belief. He develops an idea, it may be, while his opponents develop another, leaving some shrewder and more moderate man to compare and take the advantage of both. In France, a republican *will* see his party right—*will* see his principle to be the best, and *vice versa* the monarchists. And he reads in favor or against republicanism in all that he reads in history. If republicanism seems to the republican to have failed in this or that case, or to be exposed to this or that danger, he always supplies a *but*, and insists that the failure was due to other causes than to this principle, or that the danger is not necessary. He makes sweeping general assertions in favor of republicanism, and tries to maintain them: as, that republics

have always done well, that monarchies have always done badly ; that Switzerland is better governed than Germany or Italy, and better in all respects ; that America is better governed than England, etc. He can not possibly admit any thing to be squarely against republicanism. He does not want to admit any thing of the kind. He loves republicanism, and wants its success. He wants to see it good and suitable, and is pained if any thing appears to militate against it ; he battles against all facts and impressions that lead to a contrary opinion ; he wants to save his views as a whole. In short, he fights against the truth, against fair consideration ; looks at all things in a passion ; sees one side, and admits that there is no other. I need hardly say that any one searching for the truth, whether political truth or historical truth, can not arrive at it because he can not seek it. He does not want truth, and he will, at most, only seek opinions that go to corroborate his party view. Accordingly, we can very rarely get sincere, unimpassioned, impartial inquiries into a political subject,—the form of government, the tariff, or any thing that at the time divides the parties.

We come next to personal prejudices. It is almost impossible for a man to have any thing like a correct opinion of himself. He never considers whether he has good sense ; whether his talents are great or small ; whether his opinions are in the main reasonable ; but he always thinks favorably of himself in these matters, and never without predilection. He is interested in making out a good case for himself, and he will do it. If he sees any thing to his advantage, he not only sees it, but feels well over it, and sight and feeling go on to magnify it together. If he sees any thing bad, his feelings shut his eyes against it, and he ceases to longer consider it. It is impossible in such cases for him to go on. One can not weigh his own faults. He may sometimes think of his past faults, or even of his present ones, if he is resolved to break off from them ; but any thing that is, and is still to be, a part of him, he can not think of to a disadvantage. It is needless to explain what miserable thinking goes on in consequence of this disposition ; how un-genuine every thing is ; how some things are thought of too much, some too little, and some skipped over altogether. Any arrival at the truth is out of the question. And if one can not get at the truth concerning himself, how can he arrive at any other truths of which

that about himself is a factor, or step leading to them? Of all kinds of knowledge, that of self will be the last to be reduced to science. The precept, "Know thyself," may be very important, but it will never be obeyed. One will not study himself. He does not want to know what he can not do, wherein he is deficient in power, wherein he is inferior to any body else, in particular to an acquaintance. He may admit his lack of education, his lack of favorable circumstances, but never his lack of natural ability. One will not admit his meanness, his moral imperfections, his wrongs or injuries to others. He may admit acts which are even dishonest or criminal, but none that compromise his character or nature. He may admit that he has done wrong, but not that he is wrong; that he has done wickedly, but not that he is wicked; just as he may admit that he has been in error on an intellectual point, but not that he is calculated for error, or incapable of grasping the truth. This is a serious matter in his education, since, not admitting his incapacity for this or that branch or subject, he is as likely to engage in an unsuitable as a suitable employment, except when, as is fortunately generally the case, that for which one is fitted he has a liking, and so does it from his disposition for it, and not from any feeling of incompetency for any thing else. And we may add that this personal prejudice goes to every thing with which the person is connected. His possessions are unduly valuable in his eyes, especially when compared with a neighbor's or a rival's. His friends, his relations, are the same. He can not pass a fair judgment on his mother, father, wife, or children; although, fortunately, such judgment is not required for the purposes of life or science, so that no great evil results from it: at least none that would overbalance the good which natural affection derives from his prejudices. In short, he finds every thing with which he is connected good, or at least better than it is. It is this selfish principle, indeed, which lies at the ground of his religious and patriotic prejudices. It is *his* faith, *his* country, *his* party, that he feels for; and he feels for it because it is his. In fact, one gets himself in the way of his reasoning when he goes to find the truth on any subject whatever. We can not here show the details in which this selfish prejudice manifests itself. Not only can one not search impartially for the truth in all matters connected with himself, but on any over which he by accident has had disputes, it may be. I know a man



who held all his life that a concordat is a treaty, because he once had a dispute on the point. Every new view that he subsequently got of the matter he tried to harmonize with his first opinion, allowing nothing to change it.

And, finally, we have the prejudices of theories, or general principles, which are somewhat different from those already mentioned, as being of purely scientific or sincere origin, or as possible to be such. We get an opinion on a subject, often legitimately, and then want to reconcile every thing to it. We infer a general fact or principle from the things that we have learned, and then want to make that principle apply to all other things. In other words, we want to understand a thing, or set of things, or it may be all things, fully; and to this end, having formulated our view, we try to see every thing in the light of that formula, or as conforming to it or corroborating it. Accordingly, whatever may be our opinion, we defend it against every thing that appears to the contrary. In this we may be right; for if we have the truth, every thing, however it may apparently diverge, must agree with it, and nothing should be allowed to invalidate it; and if we rightly infer our opinion of the truth from all the facts which are known—that is, make it a general formula expressing them—we can find no objection to this way of thinking. But we often form our opinions on very few facts, or else on very insufficient reasonings, and then we are apt to hold to them with such uncompromising tenacity that we overlook evidence which might overturn them—entirely new evidence, perhaps, which has come to light since we first formed our opinion. We are in great danger of shutting our mind, after getting an opinion. In fact, the word conclusion implies this,—to conclude or shut up thought on the matter, and take the result instead of the previous elements of thought. It is having this conclusion—although falsely gotten, perhaps—that makes the religious and political partisans so biased in their consideration of every thing. All that appears to them at all, must be seen in accordance with the conclusion, or not be thought of at all. What the mind does in such cases, when there are dissentient facts, is generally not to consider them, or, at least, not to reconsider the whole of the facts into which they enter. There is, perhaps, a limit in our thoughts where we should not complain if men do shut up their minds, seeing that some things they can not settle

at all, and others they can not get any nearer to if they consider ever so long ; so that any body, who will have an opinion at all, must dismiss the data or original phenomena, and accept in their stead his conclusion. Only persons of no opinions, and of no decision of character, can keep a question open forever, and always look impartially at both sides. To be prejudiced for a side which we have taken, is necessary to the mind. Often it is nothing more than holding to an opinion rightly formed, when new subjects, apparently against it, present themselves, preferring our previous investigations, and the impressions which they left, to this new argument, or to the seemings on the other side. But to do this before we have exhausted our powers of inquiry in this, is the cause and the essence of intellectual prejudice.

How, then, can we remedy our prejudices, or avoid them ? How search for truth without being troubled by them ? How find the truth notwithstanding them ? The only way, as far as the conduct of our understanding is concerned (for we shall not now speak of the objective methods of science), is to examine once all sides of a question for the truth ; investigate by all means, and through all elements ; and from these form our general principles or systems, of which the particular truths will then be only parts, and so not contradictions. That is, we should try to get the whole truth, or a universal truth, in our beliefs or theories, to which new truths and partial truths, as they are afterward discovered, will harmoniously join, and be gladly received by us. To do this, we must not only enlarge our minds to a more comprehensive grasp and to profounder considerations of matters, but we must also go outside of the ordinary formulas for the apprehension and expression of our propositions. We can not maintain or formulate any intelligent truth in such loose terms as that the Thirty-nine Articles are true, that Methodism is right, or that republicanism is best. We are to seek more general truths, that will embrace also the exceptions, qualifications, and dissentient facts embraced in most positive formulas. Furthermore, as a moral aid in the same direction, we must give ourselves up to right action, so that we shall have no interest in maintaining any thing which is not true. He who would have no prejudices, and be consistent in his theories, as well as his desires, must be radically ultra in practicing the right ; doing right in all cases, and welcoming it

before any thing else, however unpleasant it may be. If we can arrive at this point—and we can, by resolution and practice—it will keep us always in the way, not only of doing right, but of knowing it; and so of knowing the truth on all the subjects on which prejudice commonly prevents us from knowing it. We will then, also, it may be, have our preferences and strong opinions; but we can hardly have prejudices, inasmuch as our preferences and opinions will then be for the truth and the right, and so have lost the principal element of prejudice. And inasmuch as they will be according to the right use of our faculties, they will, if they can be said to contain any prejudice at all, participate only in such as is necessary; and, if they are erroneous even, will nevertheless be subjectively correct.

---

#### IV.—BIBLE REVISION.

*The English Hexapla.* London: Samuel Bagster.

*Bishop Ellicot on Revision.*

*Archbishop Trench on Bible Revision.*

*Dean Westcott on the English Version.*

*Dr. Schaff's Reprint of Ellicot, Trench and Westcott.*

THE name of William Tindale stands second to none among all the mighty names that illustrate the sixteenth century. The contemporary of Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli, he was the peer of the greatest of these leaders of the Reformation, whichever of the three we may please to select as the first. Luther and Calvin died in their beds, after all the machinations of Rome had done their worst; Zwingli fell in battle against the Apostasy; Tindale, after bequeathing to the English-speaking nations the greatest boon they ever received, the "Living Oracles" of the living God, alone perished at the stake, the victim of the English hierarchy and their spiritual as well as temporal head, Henry VIII.

But, though Tindale was the true father of the English Bible, he has to a great extent been robbed of the honor of his illustrious paternity;

and the robbers were that same Anglican hierarchy whose unrelenting machinations were the means of bringing him to the stake. Tindale's New Testament was first published in 1527; and Archbishop Cranmer's reprint (for it was substantially a reprint) appeared in London in 1534, seven years after Tindale's, and about two years before the translator was strangled and burned at Vilvorde, in the Netherlands. But though Cranmer took Tindale's book, he suppressed Tindale's name, and put his own in its place; and the delusion is still kept up, even in Bagster's "Hexapla;" for there we see what is called "Cranmer's Translation" standing side by side with Tindale's, although any one can see the one is almost an exact copy of the other.

What was called the "Bishops' Bible" is almost a reprint of Cranmer's, and consequently a plagiarism of Tindale's. The "Bishops' Bible" was the text from which King James ordered his version to be made, forbidding it to be changed except in totally prohibiting the translation of the ecclesiastical terms. This rule secured the alteration of Tindale's version of Acts xiv, 23: "And when they [Paul and Barnabas] had ordained them elders by election in every congregation." The king ordered the words "*by election*" to be erased, and "*congregation*" to be altered to "*Church*."

Now, the one point to which we limit our attention, at present, is to ascertain whether the expunging of these two words, "by election," was, or was not, a mutilation of the meaning of the Holy Spirit; and if it is demonstrated, with all the evidence that the case admits of, that such a mutilation has actually been inflicted on the Word of God, we will next inquire whether fidelity to our Master does not demand of every Christian that he shall protest against the continuance of such a mutilation in a revised Bible.

In entering on our inquiry, whether King James's translators falsified the English Bible in making this change, it is well to remember two classes of facts: The first is, the very great improbability that Tindale should be mistaken in telling us that Paul and Barnabas ordained elders *by election* in every congregation. We are sure he was a competent Greek scholar. Ellicot expressly asserts the competency as well as honesty of Tindale as a translator. At page 106, speaking of the "English Version," he says, "It is substantially a version made by one faithful man long ago." From this simple statement

we infer, in passing, that if Tindale was faithful in his version, King James's men were not faithful in "substantially" laying hands on Tindale's version, and then, in their famous (*infamous?*) dedication to their King, signing themselves "The Translators of the Bible," when they were "*substantially*" the stealers of the blood-bought labors of the man whom their forefathers had martyred, and whose very name they were still continuing to suppress.

The two essential qualities of a witness were possessed by Tindale. These are, knowledge and sincerity. His knowledge is demonstrated by his unrivaled version—unrivaled, in being the substance of all the versions that have followed; his sincerity, by laying down his life a sacrifice, which he lived in the daily expectation of offering. He thus stands on the level of Christ's apostles, being sure of his facts, and taking his life in his hand.

If such evidence needs confirmation, we find it in the notable fact that Tindale's translation, "*by election*," in Acts xiv, is confirmed by the two archbishops, Cranmer and Parker, who were Episcopalians, and by the Geneva translators, who were Presbyterians. The worldly interests of all these men were opposed to Tindale's version on this point, yet they all sustained him. Their scholarship was never called in question.

Now, the facts in regard to James and his self-styled translators are entirely different. Their competency in knowledge being granted, their honesty may be fairly denied. If James was the most learned of modern kings, he was certainly one of the most demoralized. His kingcraft was lying; and, when he supposed his interest called for it, he did not scruple to perjure himself. Before leaving Scotland, to assume the English crown, he called God publicly to witness that he would maintain Presbytery in his native land; but no sooner did he find himself secure in his elevation, than he set himself to bribe the poor Presbyterians with archbishoprics and bishoprics to help him in violating his oath. Such a man was fit for falsifying the Word of God, which condemned his tyranny in Church and State. Tindale's Bible—nay, his own "Bishops' Bible"—declared that Paul and Barnabas ordained or appointed "*elders by election in every congregation*." All the world knew that James's bishops alone appointed elders or presbyters in all the parishes of England, without any election at all, while these bishops were the mere nominees of James himself.

This concentrated despotism, which still flourishes in the Anglican Church, was exposed by all the Protestant versions of the English Bible; the Popish version of Reims being the only one that excluded the words "*by election*" from the text—words fatal to the tyranny of Rome. In this, as in most other things, James proved himself a true son of Mary Stuart. He issued his royal edict that ecclesiastical terms *should not be translated*. *Cheirotoneo* was the leading ecclesiastical term. He had Greek enough to know that that word meant to choose to office by the holding up of the hands of the electors; and he ordered the light to be put out that showed and shamed his works of darkness, though the light was the light of the Holy Spirit. This blasphemous impiety has been kept up in all succeeding generations, and Ellicot and his brother bishops have taken in hand to continue it forever; and Baptists and Presbyterians, Methodists and Congregationalists, are banded, as one man, to maintain the impiety.

Now, on what ground is this alteration of Tindale's version sustained? Dr. Hackett, and I presume Dr. Thomas Conant, and I know Dr. John Eadie, of Scotland, and Biblical Professor in the United Presbyterian Church, allege that *cheirotoneesantes* agrees with Paul and Barnabas, and shows that they alone were the agents. Such was Dr. Eadie's language a few years since, when I met him in Edinburgh. I replied: "Did not Erasmus know that as well as you? Could not John Calvin construe the sentence? Why did they both translate as I do? Had they no reason?" I received no answer. *I demand an answer now.* Dr. Hackett is dogmatic, rather than didactic, when he says (page 200 of his Notes on Acts), "That formality [of holding up the hand] could not have been observed in this instance, as but two individuals performed the act in question." Suppose that one of Dr. Hackett's pupils, misled by such confident language, should take it into his head to argue that Noah actually built the ark with his ten fingers, and filled it with living creatures, and with food to keep them alive during their long voyage, because Moses actually declares (Gen. vi, 22): "Thus did Noah: according to all that the Lord appointed him, so did he," ἐποίησε, namely: Is it not clear the young logician might maintain that but one individual performed the acts in question? We are twice assured, in one breath, that Noah did it all. It would be all in vain for the doctor to



tell his smart pupil that all that the historian meant to imply was, that Noah took all the help he needed for his great works, and that God intended he should; for he might remind his teacher that Noah lived in the days when there were giants on the earth, and when mighty miracles were common things.

But, seriously, when Dr. Hackett writes in this fashion, he seems never to have met with such language, though all authors, sacred and not sacred; and all languages, classical and not classical, are full of such examples. Let him go on from the sixth chapter of Genesis to x, 11, and he will find Asshur building Nineveh and three other great cities. The aorist *ookodomeese* has no nominative but Asshur. If Dr. Hackett would undoubtedly explain such statements by saying, all that Moses meant was to say that Noah and Asshur commanded the things to be done, why may we not say that Paul and Barnabas are spoken of as electing the elders when they commanded the congregations to elect them?

Solomon, in both Testaments, is said to have built the temple; and in 2 Chronicles viii, 4, he is said to have built Tadmor in the wilderness, and all the store cities, though no one supposes he touched a stone with one of his fingers. Did not Nebuchadnezzar, as he walked in his palace, exclaim: "Is not this great Babylon that I have built for the house of the kingdom, by the might of my power, and for the glory of my majesty?" *He*, Nebuchadnezzar, built great Babylon, though he never fingered one of its bricks. It was the might of *his* power, because *he* wielded it in the millions of his slaves, who sweltered in his brick-kilns, toiled beneath the glare of the Eastern sun, in tilling his fields and gathering the rich harvests of Mesopotamia, just as we read of Joseph "gathering into all the cities of Egypt" the overflowing produce of the seven years of plenty that could not be counted. (Gen. xli.)

Such are a few of the examples which we have gleaned from the Old Testament Greek, which we know is the Greek of the New. Let us now survey the *usus loquendi* of that which is our battle-field. There we shall find ample confirmation of all that we have said. For instance (Matt. ii, 13), the angel tells Joseph, "Herod will seek the young child to destroy him." It would be ridiculous to say that Herod left his palace in the search. We know he told the wise men to "*search diligently*." In Matthew vii, 24, we read of the

"wise man who built his house on the rock." Luke says he dug deep to reach "the rock." Surely, Dr. Hackett does not suppose for a moment that he dug and built with his own hands? No: he is said to have done both, because he ordered the operations, and probably paid for them; and therefore the work is called *his*.

Matthew (xiv, 10) tells us that Herod Antipas "sent and beheaded John;" and yet Mark says (vi, 16) that "that fox," when he heard of Christ's miracles, exclaimed, "It is John whom *I* beheaded;" and Luke (ix, 9) writes, "Herod said, John *I* beheaded." His terrified conscience did not allow him to have recourse to Macbeth's shift: "Thou canst not say that *I* did it."

Let us consider Luke xii, 16, etc.: "The land of a certain rich man bore well: and he was reasoning in himself, saying, What shall I do, for I have nowhere to gather my fruits? And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and greater ones I will build; and I will gather there all my produce and my good things. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast many good things laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, be merry. But God said to him, Senseless one, this very night they will demand thy soul from thee; and the things which thou hast prepared, whose shall they be?" Surely, no one can be so silly as to fancy that this easy "soul," who loved his couch, his fatted calf, his wine, and his jollity so well, really meant to pull down the old barns and build the big ones with his own soft hands? No: what he meant was, he would *order* all to be done. Even the orders were work enough for him; for he does not talk of "taking his ease" till all was ready. But at the very moment when his imagination was kindling at the picture, the executioners got their order to take his life.

In Luke xxiii, 53, we are told that Joseph took down the body of Jesus, wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a tomb. Here three actions are referred to Joseph alone. Are we, then, to believe that he alone did all with his own hands? We know from John's Gospel that Nicodemus joined him in the pious work. Nor is there any reason to suppose that they had no help in the delicate and difficult work of drawing the spikes from the hands and feet, and lifting down the sacred body from the cross. In Matthew xxvii, we learn that Joseph rolled a great stone to the door of the tomb. Now, will Dr. Hackett maintain that Joseph rolled the stone with his unaided hands?

Surely, he was not stronger than the two Marys and the other women combined, who were puzzled at the thought how the stone was to be removed. We know that an angel rolled it away. It seems reasonable, then, to believe that he had help in placing it where it stood at first. We are confirmed in this by the fact that Matthew also says it was Joseph who hewed out the rock to form the tomb. Such laborious work was not suited for the hands of an honorable and rich counselor. We believe, therefore, he is said to have done the work because it had been done by his orders.

In Luke xxiv, 20, Cleopas accuses the chief priests and the rulers of crucifying Christ. Crucifixion we know was not a Jewish punishment, and we know also that the chief priests and rulers had no power to inflict death in any form. We are sure, therefore, that Cleopas accuses them of the crime because they had clamored for its commission.

In the same way must we expound Peter's words in Acts ii, 23, where, preaching to the Jews, he says, "Him [Jesus], given up by the fixed purpose and foreknowledge of God, ye took, and with lawless hands crucified and killed;" and verse 36: "Let all the house of Israel then surely know, that God hath made this Jesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ." Had these murderous, gainsaying Jews not been pierced to the heart by the two-edged sword of the Spirit in the hand of the apostle, never would they have cried out in their agony, "Men, brethren, what shall we do?" They would have fastened on the seeming absurdity of being accused of crime in doing what God had beforehand determined should be done, and claimed credit for having been co-workers with God; and they would have added, what Peter knew to be true, that it was Pilate and the Roman soldiers, not the Jews, that had actually crucified Christ. Not a word of all this, because they knew in their souls that had they not cried, again and again, and a third time, "CRUCIFY HIM!" Jesus would not have been crucified. Peter therefore justly accused them of doing what they had so fiercely insisted should be done.

Our last example is found in John iii, 22, where we are told that "Jesus" "was baptizing" in Judea: ἐβάπτιζεν. We learn, however, from the next chapter, that the act was not performed by our Lord personally, but by "his disciples." It is clear, then, that Jesus is said to have baptized because the ordinance was performed by his authority.

From all these examples, in both Testaments, the inference is plain that there is not the smallest difficulty in supposing that the voting, which could only be performed by the congregations, is referred to the apostles because it was done by their authority. Dr. Hackett allows, what it is impossible to deny, that *cheirotoneo* "*properly*" means to choose by holding up the hand. He adds that, in a general sense, it may mean appointing without holding up the hand. Of course, if he denies the *proper* meaning, he must prove the improper one. But that he does not attempt, except by a mere assertion, which all the examples above quoted prove to be groundless. As for what the doctor calls Neander's "*conclusions*," and which fill almost a page of his octavo, they are rather inaptly named; for no "*conclusion*" is reached. They are mere *may be's*, which prove nothing,—which could easily be shown, if space allowed. Why does Neander say nothing of *cheirotoneo*, while piling up his possibilities? No wonder a man does not know where he stands, when he puts out the light.

I will now prove that this compound verb, which occurs but twice in the New Testament, never bears any sense but the proper one. The "*general*" meaning, as Dr. Hackett calls it, of "*appoint*" can not be the meaning in either of the two places where the word *cheirotoneo* is found. Had Luke and Paul intended mere appointing, they would certainly have employed *kathisteemi*, and not *cheirotoneo*. Thus, in Acts vi, 3, the apostles order the disciples to choose deacons, whom they, the apostles, would "*appoint (katesteesomen)* over this work." Here Drs. Hackett and Conant, as well as the English Version, render *appoint*. Dean Alford, very properly, refers to this passage as proving an election by the Churches of Lystra, etc. Why should any one suppose, unless he is under some bias, that the apostles would appoint elders at their own hand, when they refused to do so in regard to deacons? Is the bread that perisheth so much more important than the bread of life?

Again: in Titus i, 5, we find the evangelist had been left by Paul in Crete to "*ordain elders in every city*." The word is also here *katasteesees*. Drs. Hackett and Conant again properly render *appoint*. That Titus did not appoint any elder who had not been previously chosen by the congregation which he was to rule, is certain, unless we will maintain that what the college of the apostles

did not pretend to do by their united authority, Titus would presume to do alone. In Hebrews v, 1, we find these words in the Bible Union version (which we take to be the translation of Drs. Hackett and Conant): "Every high-priest *appointed* for men," etc. Here again the word is *kathistatai*. As God had settled the high-priesthood in the family of Aaron, there could be no vote in that case: so it is not *cheirotoneo*, but *kathisteemi*, that is employed. In Hebrews viii, 3, we again meet with the same word: "Every high-priest is *appointed*." Here, also, the Bible Union properly replaces the Episcopal "*ordain*" by *appoint*.

Now, then, the question is pertinent: If Paul and Luke always employ the word for appoint (*kathisteemi*) when simple appointing is meant, why should they use a totally different word (*cheirotoneo*, in Acts xiv, 23; and 2 Cor. viii, 19), if they meant appointing and nothing more? And why do Drs. Hackett and Conant, in these four cases, translate *appoint*, and in Acts xiv, 23, also render by appoint? This is a mere confounding of two words totally different.

The word *kathisteemi* occurs twenty-two times in the New Testament, and sixteen times it may be properly rendered *appoint*. It were strange if such a common word were synonymous with one so different and so seldom used as *cheirotoneo*. Had Luke intended to say in Acts xiv, 23, what he had already said in Acts vi, 3—namely, that the apostles merely *appointed* officers—he would, unquestionably, have used the same word *kathisteemi* in both. The fact that he employs a totally different word, and one that he uses but this once, either in his Gospel or in the Acts, demonstrates that he had something totally different to say; and that something was, that Paul and Barnabas, in appointing elders in all the congregations, *ordered* A CHEIROTONIA: *that is, a holding up of hands*; or, took a vote of the disciples.

Let us now listen to the greatest scholars of the sixteenth century as to the true meaning of Acts xiv, 23. Our first witness is Erasmus, a name second to none in learning and genius. Born over twenty years before Luther, he, more than any other, stimulated that mighty movement which had already begun in the fifteenth century, and in which Luther was soon to take the leading part. Superior to Luther in erudition, he stood far below him in force of character and in unbending, fearless integrity, as well as in profound piety.

Still there was meaning in the saying of the monks, that Erasmus laid the egg which Luther hatched, as well as in the adage: "Si Erasmus non lyrasset, Lutherus non saltasset"—*If Erasmus had not played the lyre, Luther would not have danced.* This father of modern New Testament criticism translated the Greek into Latin. His version, *verbatim*, is this: "And when, by suffrages, they had created for them elders in every congregation," etc. I translate Erasmus's *ecclesia* by *congregation*, because so he defines it in his notes; *congregation* is really what he means. Sir Thomas More abused Tindale for always putting *congregation* for *church*; but Tindale replied, that More's "*darling*" Erasmus meant *congregation* by *ecclesia*; and that he (Tindale) would never allow the word *church* to pollute his translation, because "*CHURCH*" was the word by which his (More's) priests *conjured*.

Our second witness is John Calvin, pronounced by Scaliger the most learned man in Europe when but twenty-two years of age. From his childhood, Calvin was equally notable for extraordinary abilities, pure morals, and the sternness with which he rebuked vice in his companions. He was, therefore, a reformer and a leader of men from his youth. Calvin was always ready enough to point out what he thought the mistakes of Erasmus, being so unlike that complaisant pensioner of Romish archbishops and half-way partisan of the Papacy; yet he precisely adopts Erasmus's translation of *cheirotoneo*.

Our third witness is Theodore Beza. Born ten years after Calvin, and surviving him about forty, he became his colleague and biographer; and it is infinitely to his credit that, possessed of first-rate abilities himself, and of the highest literary culture, he always looked up to his master with the most admiring veneration. Still he was no slavish follower. His Latin version of the New Testament often differs from Calvin's; but it is identical on Acts xiv, 23.

Our fourth witness is Henry Stephens, the greatest of all lexicographers, and prince of the reformed press of the sixteenth century. This illustrious man, whose Greek Thesaurus has been published by Valpy in ten volumes folio, is remarkably precise on our text. He translates: "And when they had appointed for them elders, or rather (*vel potius*) appointed them by suffrages." It would have been better for Edward Robinson's Greek Lexicon if he had looked more to Stephens, and less to Wahl and Bretschneider. He might



then have escaped what is something worse than a blunder; namely, adding a verse to Second Timothy, as well as to Titus, which verses do not belong to the true sayings of God, but are the lies of the hypocrites who brought in the Apostasy.

Our fifth witness is William Tindale. In addition to what was formerly stated in regard to his competency, it may be proper to remove a prejudice against Tindale's scholarship which has been raised by M'Knight, whose work on the Epistles has had a wide circulation in America as well as in Great Britain. He tells us (Vol. I, pp. 13, 14): "It has been commonly said that Tindale made his translation of the New Testament from the Greek; but no such thing is said in any of the editions published by himself or by Joye." Tindale was a man of apostolic purity, who courted not the praise of men. Doubtless, availing himself of all the help which the Vulgate and Erasmus's Latin and Luther's German afforded him, he might scruple to make any such pretension as that he was guided *solely* by the Greek. But that M'Knight writes without due acquaintance with the subject, is clear from what we find in Bagster's "Hexapla," page 18. There we find the following title-page of his revised edition of 1534: "The Newe Testament, dylygently corrected and compared with the Greke by Willyam Tindale: and finished in the yere of oure Lorde God A. M. D. XXXIII." As for Joye, he was a tool of the Dutch pirates, as impudent and greedy as themselves, who, pretending to correct Tindale, had the audacity to alter the text with no knowledge but what he got from the Vulgate.

Tindale's translation of Acts xiv, 23, "When they had ordained them elders by election in every congregation," proves that he did not translate from the Vulgate, nor from Luther's German; for "*by election*" is suppressed in both. Nor will it do to pretend that Tindale implicitly follows Erasmus's Latin; for the man who had translated one of the orations of Isocrates must have had more than "some knowledge" of the Greek, as M'Knight reluctantly allows, qualifying his admission by an *if*.

But it is not only certain that Tindale was a good Greek scholar, but he was more than this, for his translation of the Books of the Old Testament was made from the Hebrew. This was denied by the Romanists—and M'Knight rather credulously seems to believe them, as one "Johnson" testifies it—when Tindale, in his preface to his tract

entitled "The Obedience of a Christian Man," declares "the properties of the Hebrew tongue agreeth a thousand times more with the English than the Latin," etc.; and when he chid the ignorant and impudent Joye for corrupting his (Tindale's) New Testament, the mercenary creature, instead of being ashamed, brazened the "matter" out, by saying, "I am not afraid to answer Master Tindale in this matter, for all his high learning in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin."

I repeat, therefore, what I said above, that Tindale's testimony to the meaning of our text has apostolic validity; having knowledge that can not be questioned, and sincerity sealed by his blood.

Our sixth witness is Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, and martyr. When John Rogers, an illustrious martyr, published what was mainly Tindale's Bible under the assumed name of Thomas Matthews—the name of William Tindale being under a ban, and it being dangerous as well as immoral to put his own—Cranmer seized the precious volume with joy, protesting "they could not have a better version if they waited till doomsday." The detestable tyrant, Henry VIII, needing all the help he could find in fighting his battle with the Pope, gave a half-reluctant consent to have the dangerous book authorized, not sure that the voice of God would be always harmonious with his own, but inwardly determined to burn or behead any one, Papist or Protestant, who should call his royal interpretation in question—a determination which he carried out with diabolic impartiality on his Chancellor, Sir Thomas More, and the Baptist Daniel Lambert, and many more. Little did the savage know he was authorizing the book of the man whose blood he was seeking. Appreciating so highly Tindale's version, it is not wonderful if Cranmer but seldom altered it; and the grand point is, that he did not alter our text, which declared that Paul and Barnabas did not (what he and his bishops were doing every day) place presbyters and elders in congregations without a vote of the people.

Our seventh witness is the Genevan translator. Who he was, is not known. We are sure he was one of the exiles in the Marian persecution. His version is substantially Tindale's, though it differs more than Cranmer's, and sometimes improves the text of the martyr. Our text, however, is retained.

Our eighth witness is Matthew Parker, tutor to Queen Elizabeth in Greek, and rewarded by his pupil, when she became queen, with

the Primacy of Canterbury. Parker, though a merciless persecutor of the saints, without which he could not have been a peer of England, was yet not merely learned, but was eager to distinguish himself as a patron of the English Bible. He parceled out Cranmer's Bible among his learned dependents, and revised their work with his own hand. It is amusing, however, to see how Tindale's successors, one and all, appropriated his labors, and put their own names on them. The truth is, the martyr's version had taken such possession of the public mind, it was impossible to displace it by a new version. All the Anglican hierarchy could do was to take Tindale's labors wholesale, and call them "Cranmer's," "The Bishops' Bible," "King James's Authorized Translation." Parker, then, as well as his predecessor, Cranmer, does not conceal the fact which condemned himself, that Paul and Barnabas did not appoint whatever presbyters they pleased over the congregations, but only such as the disciples had chosen by vote.

Our ninth witness is Giovanni Diodati, a learned Italian, and near relative of Milton's friend, Carlo. This exile for the truth of God had the deserved honor of teaching in the school of Calvin and Beza. His version of the Bible has always enjoyed, not merely the admiration of the learned, but the confidence and love of all who loved Christ and who could read Italian. When the Bible Union brethren tried to secure the countenance of the American Bible Society to a new Italian version, they were told that scholars were not to be found who could supersede Diodati.

The managers of the American Bible Society were not aware, any more than the Bible Union, that they were every day printing inconsistencies; inasmuch as, in the English Bible, they were telling the world that Paul and Barnabas ordained elders without any vote of the congregations, and in the Italian Bible that a vote was previously taken. Diodati's distinctly declares that the apostles did not appoint without a *vote of the congregations—per voti communi*.

Our tenth witness is the Belgic Bible. Horne, in his "Introduction," tells us (v. 5, p. 110): "This Dutch version is highly valued for its fidelity. The translation of Acts xiv, 23, is in their words: 'En als zij hun in elke gemeente, mit opsteken der handen, Oüderlingen verkoren hadden,' etc.; literally: 'And when they had chosen for them elders in every congregation with upholding of

hands.' Hands *held up* were *voting* hands, not ordaining hands, which are always *laid on*. I quote from a copy of the Dutch Bible, printed in London by the British and Foreign Bible Society, but supplied by the American Society—both societies concurring in the glaring inconsistency of teaching one thing in their English Bible, and another thing altogether in their Italian and Dutch and French."

Our eleventh witness is David Martin, of Utrecht. Both the Bible Societies just mentioned have fallen into the same inconsistency in regard to their English and French Scriptures, that we find in their English on the one hand, and their Italian and Dutch on the other. Martin translates our text thus: "Et apres que, par l'avis des assemblées, ils eurent établi des anciens dans chaque église," etc.—"And after, by the advice of the assemblies, they had established elders in every Church," etc. The rendering is rather clumsy, but it conveys the sense.

Our twelfth witness is Francis Turretine, professor in the college and pastor of the Church at Geneva. This man was a worthy successor of Calvin and Beza. His four volumes on theology are a splendid monument of his learning and piety. In his third volume, page 194, we find: "Apostoli oppidatim," etc.; that is, "The apostles in every town appointed elders by a *holding up* of the people's hands." He discusses the whole question at great length, with great acuteness and ample erudition.

Our thirteenth witness is John Owen, Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge, and the leading Congregationalist of the seventeenth century. In Orme's edition of his works (Vol. XVI), he discusses thoroughly the meaning of apostolic *cheirotomia*, and proves, in my judgment, unanswerably, the election of the apostolic elders by vote. It is rather a slur on the boasted enlightenment of the age, that the Congregationalists of the nineteenth century seem to have forgotten the lessons of Owen. In a large, handsome octavo, entitled "Ecclesia," published a few years since, in London, by the leading ministers of the denomination, and intended to set forth their views of Church order, the *cheirotomia* seems never to have been heard of. Dr. John Staughton, who was a delegate to the recent Conference in New York, in the leading paper, entitled "Primitive Ecclesia," tries to prove the election of ministers by vote, and

seems totally unaware of the true meaning of the one decisive test on his subject.

Our fourteenth witness is Dean Alford. In Volume II, page 146, he says: "The word will not bear Jerome's sense of '*laying on of hands*,' adopted by Roman Catholic expositors. *The apostles ordained the presbyters whom the Churches elected.*" The italics are the dean's. Two things deserve notice here: First, Alford should not have written as if Jerome's notion of the laying on of hands were limited to Roman Catholics. His own Bishop Liddel, in his translation of "Parson's Lexicon," gives Jerome's view as the *ecclesiastical use*. He does not, indeed, quote Acts xiv, 23, which he ought to do if what he says about "*ecclesiastical use*" were true. Does not his silence imply that the bishop does not believe that Jerome's view is correct? The other thing I wished to remark on Alford's words is this: though he is so clear, in his Commentary, that the Churches elected the presbyters, in his popular translation, published since his Commentary, he says the apostles "*elected them.*" (See Acts xiv, 23.)

Our fifteenth witness is Lechler, Professor of Theology in Leipsic. "Lange's Commentaries" (Vol. IV, N. T., page 272): "*Cheirtonein* signifies, *to raise the hands; to vote; elect by stretching out the hands.* The expression accordingly suggests the thought that the apostles may have appointed and superintended a congregational election; and this view is supported by the circumstances related in chapter vi, 2, when the Twelve directed that the election of the seven should be held. Indeed, the very nature of the case would seem to have required that the apostles should be guided in their decision by public opinion, and by the confidence reposed by the members of the congregation in certain individuals."

If this is true, as I am sure it is, why is the truth not put into the text? There we find these words (ver. 23): "And when they had ordained [chosen] them elders in every Church." The reader, I presume, is indebted for this to Dr. Schaff's translator, who seems not to be aware that, if Lechler is not mistaken in his exegesis, it was the Church that *chose* the elders, not the apostles. True, Lechler hesitates; but, after all, his judgment decidedly preponderates in favor of a choice by the Church. Why does Schaeffer turn the balance the other way?

Our sixteenth, and last, witness is Edmond Pressensé, Member of the French Assembly, and the historian of the three first centuries of Christianity, whose work was crowned by the Academy. This pre-eminent man, equally distinguished by learning, genius, and eloquence, thus expresses himself (Vol. I, page 454): "Après avoir," etc.—"After having rapidly traversed the cities where they had proclaimed the gospel, and having there presided at the election of elders," etc.

In surveying the whole ground, the case seems very clear. We do not say that something plausible may not be alleged on the opposite side; for what subject, however plain, has not been puzzled by ingenious or interested sophistry? We are well aware of what has been alleged from Acts x, 41, from Josephus, Philo, etc.; and have no difficulty in reconciling them with what we have said. But space forbids us to enter on them here. Meanwhile it is sufficient to say that the great scholars, whose decisions we have brought forward, certainly knew all these points as well as the objectors, but did not think them worthy of being mentioned. Any one now presuming to set their decisions aside, must be provided with reasons for putting these sixteen competent (some of them *unrivaled*) witnesses in the wrong. It is, however, characteristic of those who have in England undertaken the great work of revision, that they do not intend to give any reasons for keeping things just as James I and his hierarchy put them in 1611. Bishop Ellicot, the Chairman of the Board that meets stately in Jerusalem Chamber, has proclaimed the determination of what he calls "The Church," not to allow what he styles her "vocabulary" to be meddled with. Page 213, he lays down the rule: "In corrections, limit the choice of words to the *vocabulary* of the present version, combined with that of the versions that preceded it" If the versions that preceded James's version are allowed, proper influence (Acts xiv, 23) will be restored to what William Tindale made it, as well as Cranmer, Parker, and the Geneva translators. But should any dissenter venture to suggest such a restoration, and should all his brethren agree in pressing his proposition, Bishop Ellicot and *his* brethren are the vast majority, and can, and, we may be sure, *will* vote it down. Why? Because their wealth and power are all on the side of keeping things just as they are.

But there is not the slightest reason to suppose that the dissenters



will say one word on the subject. I have spoken with more than one or two, and they seem to know nothing of what Erasmus and Calvin, etc., taught on the point in hand. And what is true of England holds in regard to this country. Dr. Schaff has republished here the three works of Ellicot, Trench and Westcott, thus tuning all the American Board to walk in the steps of the Anglicans. And, as we have seen, Drs. Hackett and Conant are here pledged to give no countenance to the "rude and rampant democracy" which, in the Churches of the Baptists, too often trouble the souls of the pastors, as it did the soul of good Thomas Chalmers in the congregations of Scotland.

Bishop Ellicot is entitled to much credit for the candor with which he unveils the intentions of his powerful party. At page 108 we meet with these significant words: "Tact and experience, and, let us not forget to add, a careful imitation of the manner in which the revisers of 1611 acted in respect of inexactness toward the Bishops' Bible (a truly admirable portion of their work), will do more for us than all rules." Is not this bargaining beforehand for exemption from "*all rules*?" Let any one hint to the bishop that the rules of translation (for surely translation has its rules) demand any alteration in the English version, he will be put down at once as destitute of the bishop's "*tact and experience*," which are surer guides than "*all rules*." It will serve no purpose to plead that the Bishops' Bible is more exact than James's in Acts xiv, 23, and that popular election should be restored to the Scriptures, from which that king and his hierarchy displaced it. The prelate of Bristol and Worcester will blandly remind the objector that he is forgetting what he (Ellicot) has published, that *that* very "*inexactness*" which allows his lordship to appoint, or rather *ordain* (for that is the word), whomsoever *he* thinks proper over any congregation in his diocese, is "a truly admirable portion of the work [of the hierarchy], and will do more for us [the hierarchy] than all rules."

And if we must admire the candor of the bishop, we ought not to overlook the humility of his dissenting assistants; for they are plainly told, if they are "*coopted*" (it is the bishop's own word) to share the honors of revision, they must not forget that they belong to those "*without*." (Page 207.) "We can not tell confidently to what extent those without will join in this work." Rev. xxii, 15: "Without

are the dogs, and the sorcerers, and the fornicators, and the murderers, and the idolaters, and every one that loves and makes a lie." (Alford's, and John Lillie's, and Bible Union version.) It must be allowed "the Church" has an odd way of coaxing the Dissenters.

It is in perfect keeping with this, what we find on page 192: "The Church, the pillar and ground of the truth, the guardian of the inspired archives, and the transmitter of them to her children." I know very well what Bishop Ellicot means by "the Church," etc. He is far from restricting the title to his own communion. He acknowledges what calls itself the Roman Catholic Church; for, in the famous debate on the Irish Church Bill, along with his brethren on the bench, he insisted on having five millions more for Archbishop Trench and his disestablished brethren, in addition to the tens of millions with which the eminent Churchman, Mr. Gladstone, was endowing them. In order to secure this additional slice of public property, Bishop Ellicot and the rest were quite willing to endow Popery itself, pleading that the Church of Rome was a true Church, inasmuch as "she held by the four first Councils." *She* is, of course, "the pillar and ground of the truth, the guardian of the inspired archives, and the transmitter of them to her children."

Now, is not this a palpable falsehood? Has not Rome notoriously guarded the Scriptures so well that all the nations of the world that looked up to her for guidance were deprived of them; and, instead of transmitting them to her children, she kept them locked up in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, which not one in ten thousand of her children could read? And what has been the course of the Anglican Church since she was broken off from Rome? Did she not persecute to the death William Tindale for giving the inspired archives to his countrymen—*HER children*? And, for nearly two centuries after, when she took, substantially, Tindale's Bible as her work, did she not allow the millions of her children to grow up in such brutish ignorance that not one in a hundred could read and understand that good translation? The bishop should speak with more modesty and truthfulness of his Church and the Scriptures; and, above all, should not have advised Canon Girdlestone's being put in a horse-pond for "opening his mouth for the poor."

But if he leaves us in no doubt as to what he means by "the

Church," he is equally explicit in telling us what is *not* "the Church." The Dissenters of Britain are not the Church. They are "THOSE WITHOUT." Why, then, does he go "*without*" his sacred inclosure, to ask those unhappy creatures to help him in giving "the inspired archives to his children?" Well, mighty as the bishop and his bench may be, they want the help of the Dissenters in keeping the Bible as James I and *his* Church mutilated and corrupted it, so that they may go on forever setting the Episcopal trap in 1 Timothy iii, 1: "He that desireth the office of a bishop, desireth a good work." Dean Alford, in his commentary on the passage, says, that to translate it so nowadays, is setting a trap for the common reader; because, in the time of Paul, there was no such officer as an Anglican bishop. This was very true; and it is as true now as then.

But, then, how did poor Dean Alford himself translate the verse in his popular version of 1870, shortly before his death? "Faithful is the saying, If a man seeketh for the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work." Ah! sad it is, because it is true, the learned Anglican, when it came to the pinch, actually reset the trap with his own hands! This was singular; but it was not so singular as what we now behold. The Anglican Churchmen have not only undertaken to reset the trap once more, to keep themselves in countenance in "seeking after" bishoprics, but they have the assurance to ask their dissenting *outsiders* to come and help them; and (surely this is a wonderful age!) Methodists and Presbyterians, Baptists and Congregationalists, gayly gird up their loins to the sacred work.

But on this side the Atlantic we behold something more extraordinary still. England is a bishop-ridden country, and "those on the outside," growing up in the cold shade of dissent, can hardly be expected to show the spirit and muscle of those fed in the rich, sunny pastures of "the Church." But here the sects are pretty much on a par; *lord* bishops are unknown. President Grant can not send his *cong   d'elire* to a dozen of clergymen, calling themselves a dean and chapter, to elect some other clergyman to be their superior, and to sit in the Senate of the United States to make laws for us all, it being understood that what is called a *cong  * (a permission), is a command. This farce, thank Heaven, can not be played here, however common it is in England. Here, then, we should naturally expect that ministers, whether calling themselves clergy or not, would show a little more

independence than to run at the bidding of the foreign lord bishops. But no: all the leading sects are just as ready in America as in England to band themselves, at the wink of Bishop Ellicot & Company, to turn the truth of God into an untruth, and to continue the manufacture of man-traps, as the bishops, Baptists, etc., are in Jerusalem Chamber, in London. The untruth is (if our sixteen witnesses speak truth, and there is any truth in Greek), that there was no voting at the election of apostolic elders, and the man-trap, if Dean Alford spoke truth, is set in 1 Timothy iii, 1, in our English Bibles. Dr. Schaff comes fresh from communing with Ellicot and Westcott, and manipulates our sects—Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists—and they are all at once agreed that it is a noble work. Said we not well, We live in a wonderful age, and we are a wonderful people? But, surely, the most wonderful man of the age is Dr. Schaff!

But something more is to be said of Dr. Ellicot's guardian of the inspired archives: "THE pillar and ground of the truth." Where did he find his definite article? In James I's version? Yes; but it is not to be found in the Greek, "*the inspired archives*," about which he writes so grandly. Does he not tell us (page 114), "The cases in which the force of the article is neglected, or in which it is needlessly and even erroneously inserted, are especially numerous?" Did not James's revisers insert *these* articles needlessly—nay, *erroneously*? Diodati has not even an indefinite article; Luther has "*ein pfeiler*"—a pillar; the Dutch, "*een pillar*"—a pillar; De Wette, "*eine säule*"—a pillar; and T. S. Green, "a pillar." I translate thus: "These things I write to thee, hoping to come to thee speedily; but if I tarry, that thou mayest know how one ought to behave in God's house, which is a congregation of the living God, a pillar and prop of the truth." It is clear, if this translation can be made good, the bishop's sonorous articles are mere wind. Let it not be forgotten that there are no articles in the Greek, and those who insert them are bound to show cause. Sure it is, Paul is not speaking of Ellicot's Simoniacal Church, nor of what the doctor also calls *the Church*, namely, the Roman Apostasy; but rather, probably, of the congregation of Ephesus, in which Timothy was now sojourning. It is to be regretted that the Bible Union revisers do not seem to have thought of this. Indeed, the main fault of their otherwise

excellent revision is the timidity with which they too often fall into merely traditional translations.

Able as we allow Bishop Ellicot to be, and plausibly as he contrives to state matters to most of his readers, he evidently finds it impossible to speak consistently on the task he has undertaken. For example, he declares (page 205), speaking as the representative of his sect, and of all the sects that are helping him, "What we want is a revised version, not an improved one." How plain is it to every one, except to those who shut their eyes, that the only intelligible ground of revising the common translation of the Bible is in order to its improvement! If this extraordinary dogma is carried out, it is impossible for any improvement to be effected which is distasteful to the Episcopal majority. It will be of no use for Dr. John Eadie, or Dr. John Angus, President of the Baptist College, Regent's Park, to plead that the best scholars are agreed that such or such a change would be an improvement. He would be sharply reminded by the bishop occupying the chair, "I have told you, in my volume on revision, that 'what we want is a revised version, not an *improved* one.'"

The last condition which we will notice of an admissible revision with Dr. Ellicot is, that no one, "on *hearing it read, shall be aware that he is not listening to King James's.*" (Page 214.) The bishop's object in this seems to be, that the difference between his version and the old one shall be so slight that his shall quietly take the place of the king's, so that Queen Victoria shall oust the Stuart from the porch of God's Oracles—a position which *he* has disgraced for over two centuries and a half. However desirable such a change may seem to all decent English Episcopalians, and to Dissenters too—for too long have their souls been grieved with the loathsome flatteries of "*the most high and mighty Prince's translators of the Bible*"—yet the bare mention of such a condition is enough to expose the absurdity of the whole undertaking. Why, Bishop Ellicot himself finds it impossible to comply with his own condition. For, in his volunteer version (1 Cor. xiii), he turns "charity" into "love." What hearer is there so dull as not to be struck in a moment with the alteration? Tindale had rendered *agapee* by *love*, and been followed by all the Protestant versions. It was the Popish version of Reims that first put out "love," and put in (what priests call)

"charity." At the very time that James and his "translators" thrust out the popular vote from Acts xiv, 23, they thrust out "love" from 1 Corinthians xiii. Why does not the bishop restore the people's vote along with his "love?" Nay: when did an *ordinary* bishop ever love the people's vote, however he might talk about "love?"

In the London *Nonconformist* of the 18th ultimo we find the following statement: The revisers "are adopting, as nearly as possible, the arrangements which were in force when the last translation was made—that of the time of James I—which we now use. No public funds have been voted to them; but they expect to receive ample pecuniary compensation for their labors by selling the copyright of the new version. Already they have received one offer for a large amount." This confirms all that we have been saying about the determination of the Churchmen to keep up the old blinds in the ecclesiastical terms; and that, as usual, they know very well how to pay themselves while defending their "craft." The news also explains how Dissenters of every color have shown such alacrity in accepting the bishop's invitation to join in the job. They will not merely have their claims as the most learned of the Dissenters acknowledged, but they may expect to be well paid for their acquiescence. Perhaps, however, they may be too sanguine in estimating their expected gains. They may be sure the bishops will have the lion's share.

And now we behold the very same game going on in New York, under the dexterous hand of Dr. Schaff, who has reprinted Ellicot, who protests against "an *improved* version," and rejoices over the "*inexactness*" of James's "*translators*" as "doing more" for him "*than all rules*;" and Trench, who (pp. 170, 171) so carefully "strains out the gnat," while he is "swallowing the camel" of Archepiscopal despotism; and Westcott, declaring his candor in the confession that James's "*translators*" had, no doubt, "made Tindale's Bible a *Church Bible*." The great publishing-houses of our commercial metropolis are, no doubt, speculating already on the richer harvests by and by to be reaped from the teeming fields of our mighty Republic. The gains, however, will be lost, if we who glory in the name *Christian* are faithful to our protest against all inventions of man in the worship of God; and if due pains are taken to arouse all the truly pious in the evangelical denominations to insist on their right, and



the right of their children, to read a pure, plain, and unvarnished translation of the Word of God. Then shall be heard a shout from our half-million disciples, swelled by millions of voices from all that is sound and apostolic on earth, crying in a tone that will strike the Apostasy pale, "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible!"

---

#### V.—FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

NO subject is of more importance to men than that of forgiveness of sins, simply because all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. All the nations, ancient and modern, who have recognized the existence of sin, have adopted some theory of pardon; and nearly, if not all, have made sacrifice of some sort necessary thereto.

There are three words used in our language for the purpose of expressing that idea; namely, *forgiveness*, *pardon*, and *remission*; and they are all necessary to express the different shades of that idea.

*Forgive* is of Anglo-Saxon origin, being from *forġifan*; meaning, primarily, *to give back*, or *to restore*—the latter being a secondary and tropical sense. *Pardon* is of Norman-French parentage, and has the same sense of forgive, though differing a shade in usage. *Forgiveness* seems to refer more directly to mental feeling, and *pardon* to external condition or circumstances. *Pardon* does not necessarily imply any change of feeling on the part of the ruler who grants it; but *forgiveness* always implies a favorable change. Magistrates, therefore, are not said to forgive, but to pardon criminals.

*Remit* is of Latin derivation, from *remittere*, *to send back*; and signifies *to give up*, or *to surrender*; *to relax in intensity*, *to forgive*, *to transmit to a distance*. All these words are used, in the common version of the Holy Scriptures, in conjunction with *of sins*; as, the forgiveness of sins, the pardon of sins, and the remission of sins. *Forgiveness* and *pardon* are used of persons also; as, to forgive a person, to pardon a person, but never to remit a person. *Remit*, in

theology, has reference to sins, trespasses, transgressions, and iniquities. Remission is the act of giving up, or relinquishing, these as a ground of further complaint or of punishment.

Primarily, God only can forgive sins. But he can confer that power on others, as on Jesus and the apostles. "The Son of man had power on earth to forgive sins;" and he said to the apostles, "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted to them: and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." Nothing being said of succession, nothing can be claimed on the ground of succession. The power to forgive sins was never derived from succession, but conferred by special appointment. Jesus forgave sins in person, while on earth, and commissioned his apostles to authoritatively publish the terms of pardon to "every creature."

#### SACRIFICE—NECESSARY TO FORGIVENESS.

The first religious act ever performed by apostate man, so far as we are informed, was the act of sacrifice. "And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering to Jehovah. And Abel, he also brought of firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And Jehovah had respect to Abel and to his offering; but to Cain and to his offering he had not respect." (Gen. iv, 3, 4, 5.)

The Hebrew word (מִנְחָה) *Minchah* is explained in Leviticus ii, 1, where it is called an offering of fine flour, with oil and frankincense; and this is the name of what Cain brought. This was a "thank-offering;" and a part of his produce. He was a tiller of "the ground," or a farmer. Gardening, farming, and stock-growing were the first three occupations of man. The first consisted in fruit-culture, the second in vegetable and grain-growing, and the third in stock-raising. The father of our race was originally a fruit-raiser. But, after his apostasy, he was driven from the fruit-garden, and sent forth to till the ground from which he was taken. Cain, his eldest son, was born after this event, and followed the same business. Abel, the second son, was a herdsman. Cain's offering was a part of the produce of the ground which he tilled. Abel's was a part of the increase of the flock which he tended.

Now, were these offerings merely voluntary presentations to Jehovah, without any direction from him, it would seem that both

should have been equally acceptable to him. And yet it is said that he "had respect to Abel and his offering; but to Cain and his offering he had not respect."

We desire it to be specially noted here, that the respect was not confined to the offerer, but extended to the offering also. No reason is assigned, in this account, why Jehovah made a difference between these two brothers and their respective offerings, unless, by a critical reading of the Hebrew text, it should appear that Cain's offering was incomplete, and Abel's complete. Cain's offering was all-sufficient for a thank-offering; but it was not attended with "the shedding of blood." In this respect Abel's was complete. But it seems that Abel offered what Cain did, and a sin-offering besides. The apostle says (ἸΙΣΤΕΙ ΠΛΕΙΟΝΑ ΘΥΣΙΑΝ ΑΒΕΛ ΠΑΡΑ ΚΑΙΝ ΠΡΟΣΤΗΝΕΓχε τῷ Θεῷ): "*By faith Abel offered to God MORE sacrifice than Cain.*" The word (πλείων) *pleioon* means *more in number*, or *more in quantity*, but not "*more excellent*," as in the common version. It is clear, from Paul's account, that Abel offered more than *one* gift. By offering more sacrifice than Cain, he received testimony that he was righteous, God testifying (ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ) *to his gifts*, in the plural. God testified to his gifts as being just what they should be; and, he doing this, Abel received evidence that he, as the offerer, was righteous. God had respect to Abel because he *believed*, and offered all the gifts he required. But he had not respect to Cain, because he *did not believe* in the necessity of offering the first-born lamb a bleeding sacrifice—and therefore he only offered a thank-offering. This teaches us the necessity of believing all that he teaches, and doing all that he requires.

No man, since the Fall, has ever received evidence that he was righteous till his sins were forgiven. And no man's sins have been forgiven, so far as we know, without faith and obedience. Abel offered by faith. Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. God must have said something relative to sacrifice which Cain and Abel heard, and which Abel believed, and Cain did not believe. This was the difference between the two men. This difference between them led to the difference between their offerings. They agreed in a thank-offering, but differed in relation to a bloody, or sin, offering. There are those, even to this day, who do not believe in the necessity of the offering which Jesus made of himself,

once for all, in order to our salvation; and who contend that he died as a martyr, but not as a sacrificial victim. They believe that without the shedding of blood there has been, and still is, remission; and they explain all the passages which speak of him as a sacrifice, or an offering for sin, as mere rhetorical figures. To them the expression, "This is the new covenant in my blood, *which is shed for the remission of the sins of many*," is as true of any apostle, or any other man who died for the truth, as of Jesus.

The lamb which Abel offered was the type of the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world; and hence he is spoken of as "a lamb slain from the foundation of the world." As a *man* he was not slain for many centuries after that; but as a *lamb* he was slain in the days of Abel, that lamb offered by Abel being a type of him. The doctrine of sacrifice lay at the foundation in the organization of the world; and Abel's lamb was the first sacrificial victim, and the first type of the Lamb of God. When this lamb was offered, God had respect to it, and to him who offered it; and the offerer's sins were forgiven, and he "received evidence that he was righteous, God testifying to his gifts."

It is important here to consider the import of the phrase, "the foundation of the world," in relation to the passage in Revelation xiii, 8: "And all who dwell on the earth will worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb which is slain (*ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*) *from the foundation of the world*." There are two words used in the New Testament, both of which are used for *foundation*. The word here used (*καταβολή*) is, with one or two exceptions, connected with (*κόσμος*) *world*. That exception is Hebrew xi, 11. "By faith Sarah herself received power (*εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος*) *into a foundation of a seed*;" but usually translated, "*to conceive seed*." The facts show, however, that she received power to do more than to become a mother. She received power *in order to a foundation of a seed*—"the seed of Abraham." "In thy seed shall all nations be blessed." "To Abraham and his seed were the promises made." "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed." This seed that was *founded* was to be received in Isaac, the only child of Sarah. "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." Abraham's descendants by Hagar were not received as his seed. To render (*καταβολῆς*) *katabolees* "to conceive," fails to bring out fully the apostle's meaning here.

Our mother Eve received power from her Maker in order to found a race called (*κοσμος*) *the world*. All this *world* became guilty before God; and he so loved the *world* that he gave his only begotten Son to save *the world*, and the Son manifested himself to *the world*, and took away the sin of *the world*. The first sacrifice had reference to this; and the time when Abel's lamb was offered by God's direction, was the time when human society was organized into a worshiping community, and this is regarded as *founding* the society of the *world*; and Jesus stands, through this type of Abel, as "a lamb slain from this foundation of the world." There was no lamb slain when the solar system was founded or organized; but there was a lamb slain "from the foundation of the world." And that was the first offering of the kind ever made.

Jesus uttered things in parables which were "hidden from the foundation of the world"—things not revealed in connection with the sacrifice of Abel, nor those of the Jews. (Matt. xiii, 35.) There was a kingdom prepared for all who would receive Jesus, who was prefigured by Abel's offering, "from the foundation of the world," when the first lamb was slain. (Matt. xxv, 34.) The blood of prophets was shed "from the foundation of the world;" and Abel was the proto-martyr. But there was no blood of prophets shed when God founded the heavens and the earth. There were then no men to shed blood, and no prophets to bleed.

God loved Jesus "before the foundation of the world"—before he was typically slain—before Abel offered to God more sacrifice than Cain. It may be true that he loved him before the heavens and the earth were made—and he undoubtedly did—but that fact is not here affirmed. God loved him before he or any of the prophets shed their blood. And this blood-shedding commenced "from the foundation of the world"—from the time when Cain slew his brother. (John xvii, 24.) That was one of the results of this offering.

God chose the Jews, who would in after ages trust, or hope, in Christ, before the first offering was presented by Abel, and before any blood of prophets was shed—before the foundation of the world. But this choice was made with express reference to their acceptance of the Lamb of God who was to take away the sin of the world. (Eph. i, 4.) When Jehovah had created the heavens and the earth, and had organized human society, his works were finished, "from the

foundation of the world." (Heb. iv, 3.) It was not necessary that Christ should "many times offer himself, as the high-priest enters into the holy places every year with blood of others; for then must he many times have suffered since the foundation of the world"—since his offering was typified by the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. (Heb. ix, 25, 26.)

"And if ye call him Father, who without respect of persons judges according to each one's work, pass the time of your sojourning in fear; knowing that not with perishable things, silver and gold, ye were redeemed from your vain course of life received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: who was foreknown indeed before the foundation of the world [before Abel offered the lamb, his first type], but was manifested in these last times for you, who through him believe in God, who raised him from the dead, and gave him glory." (1 Peter i, 17-23.) Names began to be "written in the Book of Life from the foundation of the world"—from the time that the first victim was offered to God. "Without the shedding of blood, there was no remission;" and no names of unpardoned men can be found in that Book of Life, only in prospect of the acceptance of the thing signified by Abel's offering, and no one who rejects the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world, need hope to find his name of record there.

There was, then, a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, when the offerer received evidence that he pleased God, who testified of his gifts by forgiving his sins through the blood of sacrifice. There is no evidence that he sent down fire from heaven to consume the offering, as has been supposed by some. The evidence that Abel pleased God was found in God's testimony concerning his gifts. The Lord required sacrifice in order to pardon. Abel offered it, God forgave him, and Abel received this as evidence that he was righteous.

Why, then, should not Abel's name be written in the Book of Life? And, in anticipation of like faith in others, of whom he was a type, why should not their names find a record there also? And in the Lord's infallible anticipation of faith in some of the seed of Abraham yet to be founded as a race, why should he not choose them as the constituent members of the first Church of Christ, even before Abel offered his sacrifice—"before the foundation of the world?"



Again: it is evident that the blood of some prophet was shed from the foundation of the world. Abel's blood was the first that was shed; and it was the only blood that was shed in connection with the foundation, or the act of founding human society relative to worship.

The forgiveness of sins is, then, an old doctrine; and, thank the God of all mercy, it is an old grace also! We look back to that day with interest. Preparations had been making for this offering for some time, and therefore it is said that it took place (מקץ ימים—*mikkets yamim*) *at the end of days*. These days were the days of solemn preparation for pardon, or forgiveness of sins, the last act of which was the "offering for sin." Abel had waited and watched with interest and much care the (מבכרות—*mibbechoroth*) *the first-born* of his flock for days, at the end of which he brought it to the altar with the fat thereof. This was probably the very first lamb that Abel's flock ever produced, and therefore the first he ever saw. If so, it was also the first that ever died, as its owner was also the first man that ever died; and both died of violence—the one for a sin-offering, and the other for his faith in sacrifice; the one the type of Jesus, and the other the type of all the prophets, whose blood was shed from the foundation of the world. Poor Abel, as he wept over his sins and the death-struggles of his pet lamb, little thought of the sad end to which he was soon to come on account of what was then taking place. This was the first time he ever saw the tide of life flow from its hidden channels; and it flowed for sins, as typical of richer blood and more perfect pardon. When he returned to his flock in the evening, and sympathized with the bereaved and bleating mother of the lost lamb, he rejoiced in the evidence he received that he was then esteemed righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and through his faith, being dead, he is yet speaking. But with all the eloquence of his faith and piety, the blood of Jesus speaks better than Abel.

Faith, sacrifice, obedience, and forgiveness, are four great doctrines of the antediluvian world. And they are characteristic of all times and dispensations, from the foundation of the world. In fact, there is much less difference in God's dispensations than is generally held. Faith and sacrifice and obedience are of perpetual demand. The greatest difference is found in the ritual, not in the state of the

heart. Forgiveness is offered on the same general terms—faith, penitence, and obedience—whatever the ritual prescribed may be. The rites have been changed as circumstances have required; but faith and obedience have been, and are now, indispensable to forgiveness.

The world before the Flood was founded on sacrifice. Let us see how it was after that event. It is written of Noah, that after he cleared the ark of all the living things which had been taken into it, "And Noah builded an altar unto Jehovah, and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings on the altar." (Gen. viii, 20.) This altar is the first one mentioned in the Scriptures, although it is probable that altars and sacrifices are of the same origin. The word (מִזְבֵּחַ) *misbach*, which we translate *altar*, has for its root (נָחַ) *zabach*, which means *to slay*; and the former means a place for sacrificing. The English word *altar* is from the Latin *altus*, which means high, because altars were built up high, or on hills or mountains, by the pagans, and are called "high places" in the Scriptures. Noah built something on which to present his burnt-offerings. The offering of these clean beasts and clean fowls was in accordance with what Noah had seen in practice before the Flood. No new revelation was made to him on the subject of sacrifice. He was a man of faith before the Flood, and continued his offerings after it as before, and for the same purpose, and with the same good results,—those which attended Abel's offerings. Jehovah's approbation of these offerings is expressed in very simple and forcible words: "Jehovah smelled a sweet savor"—that is, he was pleased with the offerings—"and said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake (כִּי—*ki*); although the imagination of man's heart [should be] evil from his youth." "And God blessed Noah and his sons." (Gen. ix, 1.) Such was the result of these offerings. This blessing is what was expected at the altar when victims were slain,—the forgiveness of sins and the good-will of God.

After the tabernacle was built, when the theocracy of Israel was founded, Jehovah spoke to Moses out of the tabernacle of the congregation, and gave specific directions relative to burnt-offerings of the herd, of the flocks, and of the fowls; the meat, or food-offerings; the peace-offerings; and of sin-offerings,—with the last of which we are now more immediately concerned.

In the first place, we notice the way in which a priest who sinned ignorantly was to be forgiven:

“And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, If a soul shall sin through ignorance against any of the commandments of the Lord concerning things which ought not to be done, and shall do against any of them: if the priest that is anointed do sin according to the sin of the people; then let him bring for his sin, which he hath sinned, a young bullock without blemish unto the Lord for a sin-offering. And he shall bring the bullock unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before the Lord; and shall lay his hand upon the bullock's head, and kill the bullock before the Lord. And the priest that is anointed shall take of the bullock's blood, and bring it to the tabernacle of the congregation: and the priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and sprinkle of the blood seven times before the Lord, before the veil of the sanctuary. And the priest shall put some of the blood upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense before the Lord, which is in the tabernacle of the congregation; and shall pour all the blood of the bullock at the bottom of the altar of the burnt-offering, which is at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And he shall take off from it all the fat of the bullock for the sin-offering; the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, which is by the flanks, and the caul above the liver, with the kidneys, it shall he take away, as it was taken off from the bullock of the sacrifice of peace-offerings: and the priest shall burn them upon the altar of the burnt-offering. And the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head, and with his legs, and his inwards, and his dung, even the whole bullock shall he carry forth without the camp unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn him on the wood with fire: where the ashes are poured out shall he be burnt.” (Levit. iv, 1-12.)

Next, the way in which any one of the congregation of Israel was to obtain forgiveness for a like offense:

“And if the whole congregation of Israel sin through ignorance, and the thing be hid from the eyes of the assembly, and they have done somewhat against any of the commandments of the Lord concerning things which should not be done, and are guilty; when the sin, which they have sinned against it, is known, then the congregation

shall offer a young bullock for the sin, and bring him before the tabernacle of the congregation. And the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock before the Lord; and the bullock shall be killed before the Lord. And the priest that is anointed shall bring of the bullock's blood to the tabernacle of the congregation: and the priest shall dip his finger in some of the blood, and sprinkle it seven times before the Lord, even before the veil. And he shall put some of the blood upon the horns of the altar which is before the Lord, that is in the tabernacle of the congregation, and shall pour out all the blood at the bottom of the altar of the burnt-offering, which is at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And he shall take all his fat from him, and burn it upon the altar. And he shall do with the bullock as he did with the bullock for a sin-offering, so shall he do with this: and the priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them." (Levit. iv, 13-20.)

Next, the case of a ruler receives attention:

"When a ruler has sinned, and done somewhat through ignorance against any of the commandments of the Lord his God concerning things which should not be done, and is guilty; or if his sin, wherein he hath sinned, come to his knowledge; he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats, a male without blemish: and he shall lay his hand upon the head of the goat, and kill it in the place where they kill the burnt-offering before the Lord: it is a sin-offering. And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin-offering with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and shall pour out his blood at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering. And he shall burn all his fat upon the altar, as the fat of the sacrifice of peace-offerings: and the priest shall make an atonement for him as concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him." (Levit. iv, 22-26.)

Next, the case of any one of the common people is provided for:

"And if any one of the common people sin through ignorance, while he doeth somewhat against any of the commandments of the Lord concerning things which ought not to be done, and be guilty; or if his sin, which he hath sinned, come to his knowledge; then he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats, a female without blemish, for his sin which he hath sinned. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin-offering, and slay the sin-offering in the place of the burnt-offering. And the priest shall take of the blood thereof

with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and shall pour out all the blood thereof at the bottom of the altar. And he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat is taken away from off the sacrifice of peace-offerings; and the priest shall burn it upon the altar for a sweet savor unto the Lord; and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him. And if he bring a lamb for a sin-offering, he shall bring it a female without blemish. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin-offering, and slay it for a sin-offering in the place where they kill the burnt-offering. And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin-offering with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and shall pour out all the blood thereof at the bottom of the altar: and he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat of the lamb is taken away from the sacrifice of the peace-offerings; and the priest shall burn them upon the altar, according to the offerings made by fire unto the Lord: and the priest shall make an atonement for his sin that he hath committed, and it shall be forgiven him." (Levit. iv, 27-35.)

Other cases are provided for in these ancient laws; but the foregoing are sufficient to show how pardon was obtained in the kingdom of God under the old covenant. The sins for which these atonements were made were forgiven in every case where the commandment was kept. It was no mock pardon. *Faith and obedience always procured pardon, let the law of pardon be what it might.*

The laws which we have quoted were in force till "the seed came to whom the promise was made." Then was heard "the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare the way of the Lord, make straight his paths." "The law and the prophets were until John; from that time the good news of the kingdom of God is published." (Luke xvi, 16.) So far as the teaching and the doctrine of forgiveness is concerned, this is a new (ἐποχή—*epochee*) epoch. John, who succeeded Moses and the prophets, and introduced a new law of pardon or forgiveness, "came (βαπτίζων) *immersing* in the wilderness, and (κηρύσσων) *publishing* the (βάπτισμα) *immersion* of repentance (εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν) *for the remission of sins.*" The Greek phrase which is translated "for the remission of sins" in this case, is the same as that in Matthew xxvi, 28: "For this is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many, *for the remission of sins.*" What it

means in one place, it also means in the other. The sacrificial blood was, on the part of the Savior, necessary for remission; and the immersion of repentance is, on our part, also necessary for the remission of sins. Neither John, Jesus, nor the apostles, threw around the expression "remission of sins" any of the modern safeguards when it related to baptism, in order to detract from the importance of the solemn rite. If it means any thing in one place, it means that same thing in the other place. If it is to be guarded in one case to prevent misunderstanding, it is to be guarded in the other place for the same purpose.

Baptism is joined with repentance, because it is of no avail without repentance. None but penitents have any right to it. Unbelievers, whether eight days or eighty years of age, can not be benefited by it. It is not baptism for *purification*, but "for remission of sins." It is not baptism for *initiation into the Church*, but "for the remission of sins." The venerable John Wesley said that it "was both the means and seal of pardon; nor did God ordinarily forgive sins in any other way." I quote from memory, but, I think, *verbatim*. Dr. Clark interprets (εἰς ἀφεσιν) *eis aphesin*, "*toward the remission*." Then Christ shed his blood "*toward the remission*." He further says, "They were to repent, and be baptized in *reference* to the remission of sin." Then Jesus shed his blood in *reference* to the remission of sins. But the doctor says that "REPENTANCE *prepared* the soul for it, and BAPTISM was the *type* or *pledge* of it." Well, which was it—the type or the pledge? For type and pledge are not the same. If it was the type, then baptism was a designed coincidence of remission. If it was the pledge, it was the *security* of remission. But (εἰς) *eis* does not mean *type of*, nor does it mean *pledge of*. John published the baptism of repentance "for the remission of sins;" not for a type, nor for a pledge of remission, but for remission itself. This is a cardinal point, and never to be yielded for the sake of any compromise.

John did not "administer baptism," nor did his converts "receive" it. But he *baptized* "in water;" and they *were baptized* "in the Jordan River confessing their sins." Confession of sins attended baptism in those days, when men and women were baptized for remission of sins. Their confession was an evidence of their repentance.

The apostles also, after the ascension of Jesus, told inquirers that



they should repent and be baptized, every one of them, upon the name of Jesus Christ (εἰς ἅψαν ἁμαρτιῶν) *for remission of sins*. They were commanded to "preach the good news to every creature; he who believes, and is baptized, shall be saved." In fulfilling this commandment, they told them to repent and be baptized upon the name of the ascended Savior, for remission of sins. The sacrifices of the olden time referred to the shedding of Christ's blood—to his death as a sacrificial victim. Those were types of this. Upon that one point, that without the shedding of blood there was no remission, their minds were fixed. The sacrifice of a victim spoke of death, and death only. There was not even a burial, much less a resurrection from the dead. But, in baptism, there is a type of a death, burial, and a resurrection. "Know ye not, that all we who (ἐβαπτισθημεν) *were immersed* into Christ Jesus (ἐβαπτισθημεν) *were immersed into his death*. We *were buried*, therefore, with him by (τοῦ βαπτισματος) *the immersion* into his death; that as Christ *was raised from the dead* by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with *the likeness of his death*, we shall be also with that of *his resurrection*." (Rom. vi, 4, 5.) "In whom ye also were circumcised with a circumcision made without hands, in a putting off of the body of the flesh in the circumcision of Christ; (συνταψέντες) *being buried with him* (ἐν τῷ βαπτισματι) *in the immersion in which ye were also raised with him* through (τῆς πίστεως) *the faith* of the working of God, who raised him from the dead." (Col. ii, 11, 12.) No institution is more solemn, and, at the same time, more joy-inspiring. Persons who have united with any of "the orders" can appreciate their forms, knowing their import. So those who know the Scripture import of this rite, feel and appreciate its beauty and solemnity. To turn away from the bleeding and death-struggling victims, the bleating flocks, the lowing herds, the moaning doves, the sorrowing pigeons, and the smoking altars—all in sad harmony, speaking only of *death*—to an institution which introduces death only for a moment and the grave for an instant, in order to proclaim an eternal victory over both, through the death and resurrection of our ever-blessed Savior, is worthy of the change of the institutions of forgiveness of sins; and justifies the evangelist in affirming that those who refuse to be immersed reject the counsel of God against themselves. (Luke vii, 28, 29, 30.)

"For I say to you, among those born of women, no one is a greater prophet than John; but he who is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he. And all the people hearing it, and the publicans, justified God, (*βαπτισθεντες*) *having been immersed* with John's immersion. *But the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not having been immersed by him.*" These Pharisees and lawyers were very religious people in their own way; and it may seem to some that the refusal to be baptized, when they did not feel like it, and their Church did not approve or practice it, was a very small matter. It is but a mere external rite. But suppose Abel had reasoned thus concerning sacrifice, and had refused to bring an offering to Jehovah, would he have "received evidence that he pleased God?" Suppose Noah had refused to build "an altar to Jehovah," and had not "took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings on the altar," would "Jehovah have smelled a sweet savor?" would he have "blessed Noah and his sons?"

Suppose the house of Israel had unanimously refused to offer sacrifice for the remission of sins, on the ground that these were mere external acts, and that they were attended with trouble, and the Lord needed no meat, and that if the heart was right it mattered not whether they presented offerings or not, would the promise appended to the act of offering—"and it shall be forgiven them"—have been fulfilled?

Baptism, as it respects forgiveness—our act on which remission of sins is granted through the blood of Jesus—has taken the place of the act of offering sacrifice; and the offering of Christ, once for all, has taken the place of all sin-offerings. Therefore "John preached the immersion of repentance for the forgiveness of sins;" and therefore the apostles commanded penitents to "be baptized upon the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of sins;" and Saul was commanded to be "baptized, and wash away his sins;" and Peter says that baptism now "saves us by the resurrection of Christ from the dead." (Acts ii, 38; xxii, 16; 1 Pet. iii, 21.) Baptism "is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." It is for the washing away of sins, and is (*συν εἰδησεως αγαθης ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν*) "*a question of good conscience in respect to God,*" not in respect to man. It is not a human institution for pardon, but a Divine one, "for the forgiveness

of sins," as it recognizes the death of Jesus for our sins, and his resurrection for our justification. This mercy-seat, where God forgives sins, stands on four pillars,—death and forgiveness, resurrection and justification. The death and resurrection are Christ's; the forgiveness and the justification are ours, by the grace of God.

Three thousand converts, on a memorable Pentecost, received the Word gladly, were immersed, and partook of their food with gladness; an immersed eunuch went on his way rejoicing; and a jailer who, with his whole family, had obtained forgiveness of sins, "rejoiced, believing in God, with all his family."

#### VI.—THE IMMORTALITY OF PLATO AND OF PAUL.

WHEN Paul disputed with such as met him in the market at Athens, some said, "'He seems to be a setter forth of strange gods,' because he preached to them Jesus and the resurrection." Ἰησοῦς and ἀνάστασις—"Jesus" and "resurrection" were strange words to them, and they took them for the names of gods. More than four centuries before this, upon a similar accusation, Socrates had been condemned to death in this same city of Athens. "Socrates," said Meletus, "is a public offender, in that he does not recognize the gods which the State recognizes, but introduces new demoniacal beings. He has also offended by corrupting the youth." In both cases the accusation was literally false; yet, in a profound sense, in both cases the teachers were advancing doctrines calculated to condemn and overthrow the existing order of things; Socrates laying new and deeper foundations for truth and morality, and Paul lifting up faith and worship from dumb idols to the one true and living God. To the Greeks, then, it was "foolishness." Epicureans and Stoics derided Paul as a "babbler," and every generation since has had its Epicureans and Stoics, who laugh at Jesus and the resurrection. These scoffers are among us to-day, and these old foundations of our faith, so strongly laid by Paul, are still the central points of assault

by the enemies of the Church. No matter what other phases of Christianity may be questioned, nor how friends and foes may differ about them, the personal claims of Jesus, and the fact of his resurrection, are questions which allow of no compromise, and concerning which the Church has never vacillated. "If Christ be not risen, our preaching is vain, our faith is vain, we are yet in our sins." His death on the cross, and his new life through the resurrection, are inseparably connected in the full conception of Jesus as *our Savior*. "He was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." "It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again who is even at the right-hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." Dying to atone, rising to justify, living to intercede,—who or what shall separate us from the love of Christ?

No wonder that Paul contended so earnestly for this great fact of the resurrection of Christ. He saw clearly that it was the keystone of the arch, the Divine sign and seal of the accomplished work of redemption, the bright and only illustration and pledge of our own resurrection, and the sustaining source of the new life into which we rise from our baptism with him in his death. The thought of this mortal putting on immortality filled him with ecstasy. The anticipation of the glory and the power and the quickening spirit of the heavenly body excited him with the exultation of a conqueror. He feels as if death were already swallowed up in victory. The strength of the strong Deliverer is his, and over the impotence of the enemy he cries, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" This is the assurance that makes us "steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord; for through it we know that our labor shall not be in vain."

How did Paul present this great theme? Not as a matter of speculation, but as a fact of knowledge. Objectively, he *knew* that the Savior was risen, because he had been seen of many, of multitudes of witnesses; not once or twice, but very often, and under all circumstances—circumstances of intimate intercourse, and of personal grandeur, and of glorified nature; not for a day only, as a bright but vanishing apparition, but for many days, especially by his apostles, who knew him so well, and other chief men and women among his disciples. *One* man may be affected with optical illusions, and see, as objective realities, what are in fact but pictures of diseased

nerves; but that many should be so affected at once, at the same time and place, and so as to create for themselves the same illusion, not only of one sense, but of several—an illusion which deceives together the eye, the ear, the touch, the clear intelligence, and the jealous, detective heart,—this is an assumption for which there is neither reason nor example. It is to confound the evidences and tests of reality, as recognized by the common sense of mankind, with the lawless and delusive vagaries of occasional indiosyncrasy or diseased organism. Paul knew how morally impossible it was that the many witnesses of the resurrection could be mistaken, and when to their testimony he adds, "Last of all, seen of me also," the proof is complete. The *objective fact* takes its place among the unquestioned phenomena of observation, a fact of experience, not to be gainsayed without denying the veracity of the senses as witnesses, and so destroying the foundation upon which all *experience* and all *reliance* in the *evidence* of experience rest. ✓

But with Paul the resurrection of Jesus is not simply a fact of the past, but the ever-living, present source of life to his saints. Its certainty is assured, therefore, not only by *objective* proofs, but also by the *subjective* testimony of the Spirit. If he "knew that his earthly house of this tabernacle being dissolved, there awaited him a building of God, a house not made by hands, eternal in the heavens," it was because "God, who had wrought him for this self-same thing, had given him the earnest of the spirit." (2 Cor. v, 1-5.) Already, he reasons, "we are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in us: and if we have not the spirit of Christ, we are none of his. But if Christ be in us, the body is dead because of sin: but the Spirit is life, because of righteousness." (Rom. viii, 9, 10.) This consciousness of life in Christ through the Spirit, though primarily derived through faith in the evidence of the objective reality of the resurrection, Paul regards as *immediate knowledge*, the intuitive apprehension of the quickened human spirit, a spiritual beholding of the sensibly invisible, that no reasoning can render more certain, and which no objections of the "natural man"—the *psychical mind*—can successfully controvert. It is the consummation "for which he counted all things but loss—the knowledge of Christ and the power of his resurrection." (Phil. iii, 8-10.) He felt it with a fervor which no persecutions could quench, and followed it with a

steadfastness which not even martyrdom could shake. Is it not true that the Church needs reviving in her consciousness of this power over death, and that her zeal languishes for the want of a livelier and deeper intuition of the glory of the hope of the resurrection?

Why was this doctrine, as announced by Paul, so offensive, both to Jew and Greek? Did not the Pharisees believe in a future state, and the existence of the spirit after death? It was, indeed, one of the doctrinal distinctions between the Pharisee and the Sadducee. The latter said, "There is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit;" the former affirmed both. Yet these very Pharisees were Paul's bitterest opponents. From the time he first appeared in the synagogues of Damascus, "preaching Christ," till he closed his glorious course in martyrdom, they ceased not to oppose and persecute him. Did not the Greeks believe in the immortality of the soul? Some of their philosophers, as Epicurus, were materialists; others, as the Stoics, were pantheists; but Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle were the great fountains of speculation, and authors of the national faith on this subject: and the innumerable idols that studded the streets of Athens furnished Paul with the text of his memorable discourse "in the midst of the court of the Areopagites." "All things which I behold," said he, "bear witness to your carefulness in religion." True, it was in the main a worthless religion. It had not even a decent basis of morality under it. The gods were only the counterparts of the popular passions and profligacy. The masses of the people were of the earth, earthy. They thought but little, and cared less, about the future. Still the acknowledgement of the existence of supernatural powers is the basis of all religion, even idolatry; and in all religions there is some recognition of a future state of the soul. Even to the masses of Athens, then—a city in which the Roman satirist, Petronius, said it was easier to find a god than a man—the simple announcement of the doctrine of the soul's immortality could have been no such *strange* doctrine as to have produced any special or unusual excitement.

To the philosophers of Athens, questions of this sort were perfectly familiar. They were subjects of daily dispute. Argument as to the natural immortality of the soul had been exhausted. Nothing new could be said or thought about it. In the "porch" and in the "garden," the Stoics and the Epicureans had denied; and in the



"academy" and in the "lyceum" the Platonists and the Aristotelians had affirmed,—till there was absolutely nothing more to be said, in the then state of physiology, on either side. Indeed, speculation for two thousand years has added but little to the reasoning of Plato on the soul's immortality; and pantheism in the porch of Zeno was as ably presented as in the subtlest schools of the present day. In both these directions of speculative thought, the Greeks have anticipated us, and left us neither hypothesis to imagine nor argument to invent. Modern science, especially physiology, is giving some crumbs of comfort to the modern Epicureans—the materialists of our day—but neither the assumption of the theory nor the nature of the argument is changed.

If, therefore, Paul had raised only this old question about the natural immortality of the soul, could he have "turned the world upside down," as the Jews of Thessalonica charged him and Silas with doing? Could he have caused even a ripple in the currents of life, if, with only the old faith of the majority of Jew and Greek, he had gone about preaching speculations older than Socrates and familiar as household gods? Paul understood himself better than this; and when he "reasoned out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead, and that the Jesus whom he preached was Christ," the Pharisees knew better than to understand him as simply a zealot of their sect. The Savior said to his disciples, "If ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others?" And so the question is pressed upon the thoughtful mind, If Paul affirmed only the old doctrine of the soul's natural immortality, what did he more than others?

It is a significant fact that "the immortality of the soul" is nowhere affirmed in the Scriptures. As conceived and taught by philosophers, from Socrates down, it is, in no representative sense, a Scriptural doctrine. According to these metaphysicians, immortality is an inherent property of the soul, and its continued life is in virtue of its own essence. Christ, and the death of Christ, and the resurrection of Christ, have no necessary or Divine relation to it. Their hope of immortality is based upon such proofs of its probability as reason can invent. The metaphysical proof, the ontological proof, and the teleological proof, are all only splendid castles in the air, resting on assumptions which are themselves baseless. Like the old conceit

of the world supported on the back of a tortoise, they find no resting-place for the tortoise. The metaphysical demonstration begins with an inadequate analysis of man's nature. It assumes that he is only body and soul. *Soma* and *psyche* are recognized, but no *pneuma*, or spirit. The body is compounded, and may be dissolved; but *psyche* is uncompounded—simple, and therefore immutable. What is indiscernible is essentially also indestructible. Plato elaborated the argument in the "Phædo," and neither the schoolmen nor Descartes have improved upon it. The vaunted demonstration of the latter—*cogito, ergo sum*—resolves itself into the simple fallacy of resting the soul on itself. The *ego*—the I, that thinks, must be assumed as the condition of thought, before the act of thinking, which is made the proof of its existence, can be realized. And even were it conceded that the soul is simple, indiscernible, of which there can be no proof, yet it would not follow that it is necessarily indestructible. Being simple—that is, of no *extensive* quantity—it could not be destroyed by division. But we still can not refuse to it, any more than to any thing existing, *intensive* quantity; that is to say, a degree of reality in respect of all its forces, and, in fact, of all that constitutes its existence: which degree may decrease through all, infinitely many smaller degrees. And thus the pretended substance may be changed into nothing, although not through division, but through gradual diminution (*remissio*) of its forces. For even consciousness has always a degree which may still ever be diminished. Consequently, likewise, the faculty of being conscious of one self, and so of all the other faculties.\* Memory fades into oblivion, imagination languishes, and, by continued diminution of strength, the powers drop away, till the boasted permanence of the soul is dissolved into a forceless inanity—unconscious even to itself. While this is conceivable, the metaphysical demonstration of the immortality of the soul from the assumption of its essential permanence and indestructibility is an impotent failure.

The ontological proof is no better. It proceeds, as Plato grounds it, "upon the assumption of the necessary participation of the soul in the idea of life, whence the inference that the soul can never be lifeless. A dead soul would be a contradiction, and consequently immortality and unperishableness must be predicated of it."† The reasoning is applied with great ingenuity and logical sequence by

\* Kant's "Critique," page 277.

† Ueberweg's "Hist. Phil.," i, 128.

Anselm in proof of the nature and being of God ; but, as Kant has overwhelmingly objected, in his refutation of the Cartesian elaboration of the argument : " If I do away with the predicate in an identical judgment, and I retain the subject, a contradiction thus arises ; and consequently I say, the predicate belongs to the subject, necessarily. But if I annul the predicate, together with the subject, then there arises no contradiction, for there is *no more any thing* which could be contradicted." \* The application of these unquestionable principles to the argument of Plato is simple. To assume the necessary (that is, the permanent) participation of the soul in the idea of life, and to do away with the life of the soul (that is, its immortality), would be a contradiction ; but simply because the judgment is an analytical one, the predicate (that is to say, immortality,) is included in the assumed subject, the permanent idea of life. But do away with this conception of the soul's participation in the idea of life as an absolutely necessary reality—which, as it is only a conception, we may—and we dispose at once, and without contradiction, of the predicate, immortality and imperishableness. The mere perception or idea of a thing can not be adduced as proof of its *real* existence. If it could, then our dreams would become realities, and it would only be necessary to *think* ourselves millionaires in order to be such. The idea of permanent life is indeed *suggestive* of the reality of immortality ; and so far good, negatively, in the discussion : but it utterly fails as a ground of demonstration.

The teleological argument, arising, as it does, from the practical reason, while it is in no sense a demonstration, is nevertheless, perhaps, the most satisfactory form in which this great question has been discussed. In the " *Timæus*," Plato founds it on " the goodness of God, who, notwithstanding that the nature of the soul, as a generated essence, subjects it to the possibility of destruction, can not will that what has been put together in so beautiful a manner should again be dissolved." Evidently we might reason in the same manner as to the human body. If we had no *experience* of its dissolution—a *priori*, we might conclude, from its wonderful beauty of structure and fitness of adaptation, that surely the good God who had made it so " fearfully and wonderfully," could not will its dissolution, not as a *necessity*, however, but only as a *probability*. But experience

\* Kant's " Critique," page 413.

furnishes the *real* answer, and the *hypothetical* or probable is at once abandoned; but, in the case of the soul, we have no *experience*, and hence can have no certainty. That God does will the destruction of many creations which he has formed in a beautiful and wonderful manner, is a universal judgment of experience; that he can not will the destruction of the soul, is a proposition, therefore, against which the *analogy of experience* testifies, and in favor of which we surely can not claim any clearly admitted or unquestioned *a priori* conception as a *necessary* predicate.

The same reasoning applies to the argument when founded on the conception of the justice of God and the recognized inequalities of this life. Because there are wrongs in this life, which are unredressed even down to the grave, it does not *necessarily* follow that there must be a future life in which these wrongs will all be righteously adjusted. The argument suggests a probability, but does not establish a necessity. On the contrary, the argument from experience seems to conclude: There are inequalities in this life permitted by God, why not in the next life, even if there be one? Besides, the most that the argument can prove is a *future* life of the soul, in which the wrongs of this will be redressed; but not necessarily an *immortal* life, since it is not necessary to assume an eternity for the correction of the inequalities of time. The redress of its wrongs being the sole end of prolonging the life, why, when the redress has been accomplished, may the life not terminate?

Evidently, therefore, there is no demonstration in any of these forms of arguing the soul's immortality. Yet, negatively, they have this to recommend them: They suggest a probability, and show that if we can not certainly infer in favor, neither can we conclude demonstrably against the conception. It must be allowed to stand as an *idea* which, at least, can not be disproved, *a priori*; and which, as a matter of revelation or a question of faith, can not, even by philosophy, be pronounced unreasonable. To her we are free to say, as Paul said to Agrippa, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?"

It has not, we think, been sufficiently noticed that Paul adopted none of these lines of argument. Our metaphysicians still rely upon them, and our theologians, many of them, follow in their wake; but by Paul, and all the writers of the New Testament, they are utterly

ignored. They proceed, as we have said, upon a defective conception of human nature, and in utter ignorance or neglect of the doctrine of life and immortality brought to light by the Gospel. The grand doctrine of the resurrection, as argued by Paul, was "foolishness" to them. Plato's man, of soul and body only; and Paul's man, of body, soul, and spirit,—are different. Plato's doctrine of sin as the effect of "bad or ill-directed education, and the corrupt influence of the body on the soul," regarding it as "a vulgar error to suppose any one willingly bad;" and Paul's doctrine of sin as a corrupt nature, fallen by disobedience, dead in trespasses, alienated from God, willfully wicked, and under the curse and sentence of death,—are conceptions of man, the breadth of the heavens apart. Plato taught that the soul, by exercise of native force, could lift itself up to acceptance with God; Paul, that "we are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." (1 Cor. vi, 11.) The self-ennobling and purifying reason (*νοῦς*) is the savior of philosophy; the crucified Son of God is the Savior of Paul.

These radical differences in the conception of man's nature necessitate totally different explanations of his immortality; and yet our theological schools—our Christian metaphysics—still cling to the Platonic psychology as the basis of their arguments. The idea of inherent immortality, and the soul as an entity separable from the body, molds our conception and faith of the future life; and the firm and grand reality of the resurrection, the full, perfect, glorified and eternal life of the whole man, in conscious personal integrity, which filled the exultant hope of Paul, is frittered away by psychical dissection, till it is little more than a dreamy elysium of disembodied spirits—airy nothings with imaginary wings, floating about in the heavenly voids, and stoically impassive to all that seems to constitute our essential humanity. There is but little for the imagination to picture, little for hope to anchor to, little for the heart to love. The philosopher's man of the future is the present man reduced by an infinite negation of all known conditions of consciousness to a metaphysical zero. We can neither think him, feel him, nor have any desire to be with him. He and his world alike elude us, as a dream unrealized.

In striking contrast to all this is the man and the future life that are given us in the New Testament. Let us consider them.

We turn to Paul for guidance, not because he teaches a different doctrine from the rest, but because his relation as the apostle to the Gentiles, as well as his marvelous powers as a dialectician, lead him to a more thorough discussion of these themes.

Paul's conception of man is, that he is a creature of God—a being, not *with* a body, soul and spirit; but a being *of*, constituted of, the synthesis of, body, soul, and spirit; in the body, allied to earth; in the spirit, of the nature of God; and by the soul, attracted into unity of person and conscious fellowship with matter and spirit, and so *becoming a living soul*:—as we say of water, it is a liquid, not *with*, but *of*, constituted of—not the mixture, but the synthesis of—oxygen and hydrogen. These gases *become* water, which is neither oxygen nor hydrogen, nor both, but a new body, with sensible properties of its own, yet with affinities dependent upon the elements of its composition. The conditions of the process we know; but the immanent principle of the new creation, and of its specific nature, is a mystery. So, with Paul, man is not matter, he is not soul, he is not spirit—a trinity of persons, with sameness of nature—but one personality, with a trinity of natures. He was the last crowning work of God in connection with this mundane creation, and so fashioned—so cosmically and pneumatically endowed—as to enjoy alike the material and the spiritual universe of his Creator. With rapture, he watched the

"Morn, her rosy steps in the eastern clime  
Advancing, sowing the earth with orient pearl;"

listened to "the liquid lapse of murmuring streams; inhaled the fragrance of the 'fertile earth' fresh-bathed in 'honeyed showers'; 'ate, drank, and in communion sweet, quaffed immortality and joy.'" Pure in sinless innocence,

"He stood and gazed, with temples bare,  
And shot his being through earth, sea, and air,  
Possessing all things with intensest love."

The whole earth was his. Imparadised in her arms, her very breath thrilled him through all his senses, as with the touch of mingled harmonies.

Nor was heaven shut out by the veil of sense. His spirit-consciousness was perfect—quick to actualize into experience the



things of the spirit, as was the sense-consciousness the things of sense. It was his nature to *know* spirit equally as to *know* matter. Not through the senses, however, but through the spirit; for then, as now, it was true that the natural man—that is, the sense-consciousness—could not know the things of the spirit. But they are spiritually discerned; and while man was yet perfect, it was his privilege to walk with God in the garden, in the cool of evening, and *know* him face to face. He walked by sight—spiritual sight—and not, as now, by faith. Things revealed only in vision, and to prophets, were the familiar glories of his happy life. The Lord sitting upon his throne, high and lifted up; the six-winged seraphim hovering above, and crying, “Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts, whose glory is the fullness of the whole earth,” thrilling with the rapture of their joy the very thresholds of the temple,—these were the open, free, and ceaseless manifestations of his Father’s presence, to which there was to him eternal welcome.

But this glorious being, so formed for happiness, so quick to every touch of material and spiritual influence, was a creature; his life was a derived life; he was dependent. Besides the trees of the garden, which were for the natural body, there was the sacramental “tree of life,” not for the body, indeed, but for the replenishment of his spirit-life—symbol and channel to him of the fountain of his being—the life of life. But his right to this tree was not a natural or inherent right. It was a grant, and a grant upon condition. “Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat. But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” (Gen. ii, 16, 17.) Shalt be debarred from the tree of life, and so perish; a condition not arbitrary, but benevolent, and, in the eternal order of things, also necessary.

This condition was violated. I assume the freedom of man as the ground of his responsibility for this disobedience; I assume the essential evil to him of eating of the forbidden tree as the ground of its prohibition, and so vindicate the necessity and the righteousness of the sentence. What was it? In the prohibition, it was, “Thou shalt surely die.” In the execution, it was: “Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever,”

therefore he is driven from the garden, to till the ground whence he was taken. Death, by exclusion from the tree of life—separation from the life of God—this is the Fall, the effect of the sin of Adam. The sin was the transgression of law; the Fall was the loss of innocence; the punishment was banishment from the life of God, and delivery of the man—body, soul, and spirit—to the resources of corruptible nature, to work out for himself such life as, in the sweat of his face, he could wring from the ground. Primarily, the blow fell upon the *pneuma*, the spirit—the image and power of God in man. Its supremacy in the nature is lost; its dominion is broken; the divine harmony of the original constitution is destroyed. In astronomy, bodies are held in their orbits by the balanced action of the centripetal and the centrifugal forces. Destroy either of these, and they rush wildly from their spheres, plunging unrestrained into the abysses of outer darkness, or sweeping with resistless speed to their common center. So with the human soul. The spirit, the pneumatic force, is paralyzed, and the flesh draws it to sin. It is brought under the power of the devil. It swings away from the “law of the spirit of life,” and comes under the dominion of “the law of sin and death.” “The law in the members, warring against the law of the mind, brings the soul into captivity to the law of sin which is in the members.” (Rom. vii, 23.) This nature we inherit—a defective nature—made defective in Adam by sin, and so transmitted to us with its proclivities to sin, and its sentence to death inherent to it. It is a “carnal” nature; and because “the carnal mind is enmity against God, is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be,” it is also a sinful nature. Descending to us from our birth-source—from our Adamic origin—it may be properly called, in this sense, also “original sin;” for “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” (Rom. v, 12.)

Such is the man of Paul,—a darkened understanding; a heart alienated from God; a life resting under the sentence of death; a nature powerless against the dominion of sin. “O, wretched man! who shall deliver him from this body of death?” Not philosophy; not his own unaided strivings; not the force of natural or inherent immortality; not the light of reason; not the righteousness of the law—nothing but the power of the Gospel; Christ, and the power of

his resurrection. What may have been the ultimate fate of man if he had been left to himself, the support of his spiritual life withdrawn, and the soul subjected by voluntary surrender of its higher power to the dominion of sin, we need not attempt to imagine? "The judgments of God are unsearchable, and his ways past finding out. Who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counselor?" Certainly, when, "with wandering steps and slow," he leaves the "happy walks and shades" of Paradise, all seems lost, and nothing left but to lay him down in his mother's lap and "meet mortality, his sentence." "Death is the wages of sin; eternal life must be the gift of God." So Paul reasons; and so we are shut up for light to the Gospel. Let us rejoice that, through it, life and immortality are rescued from the darkness of speculation, and brought sensibly, demonstrably, as a fact of observation and proof, into the open field of our experience. If the demonstration of reason reaches only a hopeful probability, the demonstration of experience assures us with certainty; if speculation can, at most, only give us hope for the disembodied soul, the power of the resurrection redeems the whole man, body, soul, and spirit.

How is this done? *First.* By a quickening of the dead *pneuma*, the generation of a new power and activity in the spirit. It must be excited to newness of life. But, subjected as it is to the flesh, cut off from direct consciousness of God by the veil of sense, it can only be approached mediately. The knowledge of God and the will of God must come to it through the sensible forms of its darkened understanding. "It must be born again, not indeed of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." (1 Pet. i, 23.) God must come to it, manifested in the flesh. "No man at any time seeth God: the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, he declareth him." "He that knoweth the Son, knoweth the Father: he that seeth the Son, seeth the Father." This is the "mystery of godliness," working in us renewal of life, against the "mystery of iniquity," working in us the consummation of death—the *pneuma*, which is the law of the mind, by Divine aid, under the illumination and quickening power of the Spirit, warring against the law of the members, and achieving the soul's deliverance through Jesus Christ our Lord.

*Second.* By the quickening, also, of our mortal bodies. "If the  
VOL. VI.—25

Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in us, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken our mortal bodies because of his Spirit that dwelleth in us." (Rom. viii, 11.) As is Paul's conception of the effect of sin, so is his conception of the effects of the resurrection. Both extend to the whole creation (*κρίσις*). The curse which fell upon man, fell also upon the earth made for his habitation. As Milton strongly expresses the thought,—

"Earth felt the wound; and Nature from her seat,  
Sighing through all her works, gave signs of woe,  
That all was lost."

The apostle says, "The creature is made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who subjected *it*." Paul was in no sense a pantheist, yet he recognized a sympathy of life and destiny in the whole creation. God is not only the source and the actualizing cause of the whole creation, but he is also the end to whom it all tends. "For from him, and through him, and to him, are all things." And, without affirming consciousness of it, he does regard it as lifting itself up by virtue of the nature that is given it, as in eager expectation of its destiny; as if, by some divine instinct of development, it were stretching forward to its goal. It moves apace with man, unfolding its treasured resources to meet all the wants and changes of his restless progress, and, in its ceaseless stir and tumult of storm and tempest, seems as if struggling for "deliverance from the bondage of corruption into the freedom of the glory of the sons of God." Through all ranks and orders of being, animate and inanimate, rational and irrational, this feeling of unrest stirs, as a deathless longing for, and prophecy of, change. It is, to the unregenerate man, the highest intimation of a future life—"the pleasing hope, the fond desire, the longing after immortality"—which is universal as man, and the deathless heritage of a hope born of the memories of Paradise. Even the regenerate, "who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption," *to wit*, the redemption of our body. "For we are saved by hope."

Wide and universal as is this hope—Spirit-born, as in the regenerate; native intimation of the soul, as in the unregenerate; or blind stirring of unconscious nature, as in the irrational creation—so wide and universal shall be the fulfillment of God, through the power of the resurrection. Our puny faith staggers before the manifestation

of this glorious power of God, and hope hesitates to grasp the rich promise in its fullness. But the centuries are rolling by, the week of our *eon* is nearing its Sabbath, and God will not be slack concerning his promises; "for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

"But some will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" And to such "simpletons" Paul replies by an argument from analogy. In the material world (and the body is matter), the order of the operation of God is, that life shall spring from death. "That which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die." The very seed, as such, perishes before the new life unfolds. Its decomposition prepares and furnishes the first pabulum of the new plant. Science has long searched for the *beginnings* of life. Its farthest research ends with *protoplasm*, which is itself a product of antecedent life, and in no true sense an original cause. We know, therefore, of no "physical basis of life" that is not derived. Neither has science been able to discover what it is in this "physical basis" that determines the character or form of the body that it shall be clothed with. Give a seed—bare grain—to the farmer, and, without science, by the knowledge of experience, he will tell you what body God hath given it; but reduce it to a pulp or a powder, destroy the signs of its identity as a seed, and give it to a physiologist, and though, with his microscope, he may succeed in finding and identifying the nucleated cells, which he calls protoplasm, and be sure that he has reached the physical *primordium* of life, ask him into what form of life this nucleus will unfold, and he will confess he can not foresee. Nature has not labeled the *nuclei* with names, and the physical basis of the lichen that clings to the barren face of the rock is undistinguishable, under his most powerful glass, from that of the majestic oak that towers by its side, monarch of the forest. Yea, more: he will confess to you that in this protoplasm, so cunningly hidden away in the nursery of its future nourishment, he can see no reason, no immanent cause, why it should quicken into life and take to itself a body at all. He can talk to you learnedly about the *conditions* of growth, and, watching the process of assimilation, tell you of the magic chemistry of heat and moisture and light, and much else that is beautiful and valuable to know; but to the question, "With what body shall it come?" he is compelled to say with Paul, "God giveth

it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed its own body ;" but the body that shall be, is different from the seed that is sown.

So also in the resurrection. The body that shall be given us is a *new* body, such as it shall please God to give us ; in some way connected, too, with the old body, and, it seems, springing out of it, but by a process and a bond of connection not revealed to the microscope of reason. It is a gross misapprehension of the apostle to understand him as teaching the mere *revival* of the old body—a magic readjustment of the old parts, or a chemical or vital reorganization of the decomposed elements that at death made up our bodies. The old mechanical conception of the sea giving up an arm, the battle-field a leg, and the grave the rest, and these adjusting themselves together again into the likeness and form of the body that died, has long since dropped out of the fanciful descriptions of our pulpit homilies ; and modern chemistry, by its vigilant pursuit of the circulating elements of material nature, has rendered equally untenable the hypothesis of a reassimilation into organic identity of the same particles that constituted our bodies before death. The "handful of just that sleeps under the daisies," of which we so tenderly sing, in more than a poetic sense looks up to us in their pensive blossoms, and shall pass from them into other forms of fragrance or beauty, in which we shall know them no more forever. "This sensible, warm motion becomes a kneaded clod," and God will make us new bodies.

No : the resurrection of the Christian's hope is not a revival, like the raising of Lazarus or the son of the widow of Nain. These came up with their natural bodies, and were still subject to corruption and death. They are beautiful illustrations of the Savior's human sympathy and Divine power, but they afford no example of that redemption of the body for which the Christian hopes. They bring to light neither life nor immortality. To a hope like Paul's they would have been saddest disappointment—a re-pitching of the old tent that he so longed to fold for the last time upon the old battle-field, that, through victory over death, he might pass, in triumph and incorruptibility, to the eternal pavilions of God.

We love to linger over these scenes. Mary and Martha are weeping, smitten in the divinest strength of woman's heart—a sister's love. Jesus, too, is weeping, moved with the sympathy of a human brother. Lazarus is dead—"dead," the people cry, in scorn of the

new bodies given.



Savior's tender assurance, "He only sleepeth." O, it thrills us to hear him cry, "Lazarus, come forth!" We tremble in silent awe at that strange greeting of the dead coming out of the cerements of the tomb, with the living standing in their weakness upon its brink. Is it a feeling of joy with which we see them embrace? Perhaps. But the heart—sobered by the sad experiences of life, weary with the heavy burdens of life, still bedewed with tears of divinest sorrow—feels a deeper feeling; looking upon that strange spectacle of death in life, thinks: "Ah, Life! thou hast still thy bitterness and heavy burdens; thou hast come back from thy longed-for rest, to take the yoke again. Ah, Death! thou hast still thy sting. Ah, Grave! thou wilt yet conquer." The night-eyed spectators upon the gloomy Plutonian shore will soon *encore* the scene upon which life has let fall, but for a moment, her curtain of light, and it must be repeated in deeper sadness. Better, perhaps, the pang of parting once over, to have left the broken hearts to their healing; better, the river once crossed, for the silent voyager to have remained on the happier shore. This is certainly not the resurrection we want. It is not the old body revived, but a new, incorruptible, spiritual, glorious body that we wait for. And it is this that Paul is speaking of. Do we understand him? Shall we think a moment on what he says?

It is an "incorruptible body." And yet material? Yes. Is not matter in its ultimate forms incorruptible? Who can think its annihilation? Organized, and by mere feebleness of the organic force, it may dissolve, or, by superior force, yield to separation; but the oxygen, the hydrogen, the nitrogen, and all simple forms remain, pure and incorruptible. It is a "spiritual body." And yet material? Yes. Not, indeed, spiritual in essence; for that would be a contradiction. Matter *is* not, and can not *become*, spirit. When we say matter is corruptible, we do not speak by analysis, as if corruptibility were a quality of its essence. We mean that, under certain conditions or forms (aggregate or organic) of its existence, this property of corruptibility attaches to it, and characterizes it. So Paul speaks when he declares the new body to be spiritual. It is a body which is under the control and domination of spirit, which is a perfect expression of the spirit's activity, which is capable of perfect and unimpeded obedience to spirit. As the body now is, the spirit is subject to it, confined and limited by it. Its ambitious soarings

droop on heavy wings ; its spiritual ideals halt in the unrealized forms of clay ; its purity is soiled by the dust of earth. Like a caged eagle that would mount to the sun, it beats against the bars only to wound its panting breast, and scream out its despair.

It is a spiritual body in the sense, too, of "not carnal." Spirit and flesh are in moral antithesis. The carnal body is the body of sin and death ; the spiritual body is the body of righteousness and life. In it the motion of sin in the members shall not war against the law of the mind in the spirit. The two shall be united into holy harmony under the perfect law of liberty. We are, perhaps, too much disposed to disparage matter. Gross matter, corrupt matter, insensible matter, inert matter, base matter,—these and like expressions of scorn show the light in which we commonly regard it. But we should correct this irreverence when we think upon the mystery of the incarnation and its incorruptibility, the glory of the transfiguration, the immortality of the resurrection. These facts ought to teach us how divine a thing matter may become. It is sin working in it that we should loathe ; it is the miserable bondage of corruption that we should long to put off ; it is the dishonor of the curse at which we should blush. Cursed for man's sake, will it not be glorified in his resurrection ?

Even in its subjection to corruptibility, how marvelous are the possibilities of change and adaptation which it reveals ! Consider that lump of ice. It is matter—dead, cold, solid, inert. We change its conditions : apply to it heat, and in a little while it is water—a liquid floating gracefully upon the slightest pressure, with scarcely sensible cohesion of parts, and clinging with fondness to every inviting surface. It rises upon the air in apparent freedom from gravity and sleeps invisible in its ample folds ; or, gathering into pearly drops, paints the arch of hope upon the brow of the threatening storm. It fringes with silver lining the curtains of the sky, and hangs the drapery of green and azure and gold about setting suns. Raise the temperature still higher, and it bursts into gas—oxygen and hydrogen—the one the food of fire on which it glows with intensest fervor, melting the granite of the eternal hills ; the other, the lightest and the most inflammable of all things known to chemistry, flashing into flame at the touch of the slightest spark, and, in mixture with its stronger brother, exploding with a power rivaling the roar and force

of the thunderbolt ; and then, as if exhausted by the mighty reaction that inflicts the blow, subsiding into the harmless, pellucid drop from which it was born.

Need we stumble at the rich promises to be realized in the resurrection body? We want to enjoy our whole nature—body, soul, and spirit. We can not bear that any part or power shall be lost. We want to enjoy the whole universe—the heavens and the earth. We can not bear to be shut out from a single star, or to lose the pressure of one hand that is dead. We want to live in conscious knowledge of God, and all that he has made for us ; and the Savior promises all through the power of the resurrection. Our spiritual body, moving with will and thought swifter than the flash of morning light, shall be ubiquitous as knowledge, and all-embracing as love. With sweeter than Memnon music shall it thrill at every touch of the Father's breath, and burn, in light and love, brighter and deeper than the seraphim in the worship of his presence.

---

## VII.—THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHRISTIANITY.

DANIEL WEBSTER, in his controversy with Senator Hayne about the import of the United States Constitution, very properly remarked that it was sometimes necessary, in the heat of controversy, to stop for a few moments in order to reconnoiter the ground, to find out where the parties stand—whether the original object is still kept in view, or whether side-issues have absorbed all attention, so that the real end of the discussion is lost sight of. It may be well for Christians, in discussing their respective views of Christianity, the tenets and dogmas of their sects or parties, to stand likewise still, and to examine what Christianity is to them, what the Christian religion is to effect, in their opinion, for the race and for the individual. As all men agree in their desire of happiness, but differ widely in the choice of the means by which to bring about this happiness, so all men—that is, all professors of the Christian religion—

agree that Christianity was introduced by its founder for a certain specific object, which is, according to the almost unanimous consent of all the parties, the securing of eternal bliss after death. Of this unanimity we shall here merely say, that if it were constantly borne in mind it would exercise a most salutary influence on the estimate and treatment of one another by the different parties.

As, however, men differ in their views about the nature of happiness and the means of securing it, so do professors of Christianity differ about the nature of that bliss after death, eagerly desired by all, and the means of securing it. Yea: it is a very strange and sad phenomenon, that many professors have not only no clear idea of the happiness after death for which they long, but it is even considered by many as an idle, presumptuous speculation to call attention to this important subject. In worldly matters, men act differently and more intelligently. Neither the European who intends emigrating to the United States of North America, nor the citizen of one of the States that intends to go West, sets out on his journey at random, but endeavors to get all information concerning the nature of his future home, especially its climate, and the probability afforded that he can make a living there, or better his condition. The notions of many professors, of the nature of heaven, that think of the subject at all, are indeed curious enough, and, when properly sifted, amount to this: that the enjoyments afforded in heaven are virtually identical with those they appreciate most highly here.

To sit at meat with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and to partake of all the good things placed before them, (will teetotalers drink any wine there?) to be arrayed in white, with a crown on their heads and palms in their hands; to walk over streets paved with gold and precious stones; to sing everlasting halleluiahs, and to shout forever, Glory! glory!—these seem to be some of the main enjoyments in heaven, eagerly desired by many sincere but badly informed Christians. In passing, one may be permitted to say that our Church hymnology is exceedingly well calculated to inspire such sentiments. This is, at least, the tendency of the songs to which we have oftenest to listen; they breathing a sensual, selfish spirit, from beginning to end, and setting forth a heaven that differs in degree, but not in kind, from the paradise of Mohammed. The influence of the Church hymn-book can scarcely be overrated; and the utmost care ought to

be taken in making a selection of hymns—hymns that do not flatly contradict the sentiments set forth from the pulpit. Hymns that sensualize devotion in the manner indicated, ought to be scrupulously excluded. It is not necessary to give examples; yet we should like to know if any other sentiments than those of a mystic quietism are inculcated by the favorite hymn, "Beyond the smiling and the weeping"—sentiments of discontent with the present life, with the God-ordained sequence of causes and effects, and a sentimental longing after a kind of Quaker meetings? To multiply examples is neither necessary nor called for by the scope of the present article. May it suffice to say, that many of our hymns breathe a spirit of utter selfishness.

After these rather lengthy remarks by way of introduction, we ask the question: What is the specific object for which Christianity was introduced by its founder into the world? (We do not look upon Christianity as the flower of the race—as the development of the highest principles inherent in the race—a position on which most, if not all, of our readers, we trust, agree with us.)

Christianity is an exotic plant—a something brought down from heaven for a certain specific object; and what is this object?

Undoubtedly, this specific object was not to do for man what man himself could do; but it was to do for man what man, in his actual state, could *not* do for himself, in order to secure his happiness here and hereafter. That mysterious Being, called by the inspired penman, the Logos (Word), that was in the beginning with (toward) *the* God, and was God, became man. In this great supernatural fact, we conceive to consist the very essence of Christianity. Whether this act—the incarnation of the Logos—would have taken place without Adam's fall; whether it would have been necessary for the full revelation of God to man, and for the full development of the idea of humanity, we do not stop to discuss here, as not necessarily demanded by our subject. This much only we say here, that if the Logos had become man, and appeared among a sinless race, he would have met with a different reception; and his withdrawal from men would have been different from what it actually was.

We learn from revelation, and we can verify by daily observation, that man is by nature a fallen being; that there is in him, in the best case, a conflict, an unnatural disharmony, amounting almost to

two contending personalities in one breast; and that the better personality, or I, left to its own resources, can not achieve a complete victory, so as to satisfy all the cravings of the human heart.

We are aware that it is often contended that this phenomenon, this powerful propensity to evil, is the consequence of training, example, etc.; but although we are more than willing and ready to admit the immense influence of these factors on the young, yet we are persuaded that these influences alone do not account for man's moral state; not to press the fact that these evil influences themselves are the legitimate result, not of an uncorrupted, but of a corrupt nature; that, consequently, these evil influences themselves prove, beyond any reasonable doubt, that in man's nature a revolution has taken place whose tendency is downward. We have always admired Juvenal's "Fourteenth Satire," wherein the sacredness of a child's nature and the pernicious effects of wrong teaching and of bad examples are inimitably and forcibly set forth. But we do not believe with the old satirist, nor with modern Darwin, that the sole cause why old storks live on snakes, frogs, and lizards, and the vultures on carrion, is, that the young animals were fed by their parents on these things; but we rather think that the parent birds select this kind of food as agreeing with their own nature and that of their young ones.

Left to himself, man could, by no efforts of his own, have worked out his own salvation, or, what means the same, realized God's purposes concerning man.

A wild tree—say a crab-apple tree—may be assiduously and successfully cultivated by the gardener by digging around its roots, fertilizing the soil, removing grubs and superfluous limbs. The tree thus cultivated will bear—bear abundantly; but the fruit will partake of the nature of the tree. In order to change the nature of the fruit, the tree itself is to be changed. The tender shoot of a good tree must be grafted upon the wild tree; this twig must partake of and become one with the life of the tree, and then the care of the husbandman will be rewarded by an abundant crop of good fruit.

So, in the case of man, something higher than unassisted humanity can produce must be made over from without, from above, unto man, and become there the principle of a new life—of a life of purity, benevolence, holiness.



That this is the philosophy of the New Testament, seems to need no proof. The Savior places himself in such a relation to the individual believer, insists so uniformly and forcibly on a real life-union between himself and the believer, speaks of the eating of his own flesh and the drinking of his own blood so boldly, as well as of a water to be given by him to the believer, quenching his thirst forever; yea, becoming in him a well of water, springing up into everlasting life—represents this gift as procured by his own death and glorification (John vii, 39, and xii, 24)—that any one that does not wish to search the Bible, but rather to learn from the Bible, can not fail to recognize these truths as the very essence of the Christian religion.

Jesus sustains a twofold relation to the human family,—he is an individual and a representative of the race at the same time. By virtue of his generic relation, he has acquired and holds in readiness these elements of newness of life just spoken of. As an individual, he has set us an example which we must study and faithfully copy. Well-written biographies of great and good men are eminently calculated to exert a very salutary influence on the careful reader, teaching him not only the way of virtue and self-denial—pointing out the enemies, difficulties, and dangers in the way of a virtuous life—but furnishing also very powerful motives to espouse the same cause of virtue. We would remind the reader here, in proof of this position, of the influence which the Homeric writings exerted on Alexander, Ossian, and Napoleon.

The life of Jesus is as much superior to any other life, as it is drawn more correctly by inspired penmen than any other biography. Now, this life the believer must study, both as a whole and in its details, and that in order to copy it fully. And here we find, perhaps, one of the most lamentable aberrations of the Christian mind, attended with the saddest consequences. Mr. Frothingham, and many other writers of his theological views, have charged the apostolic writings, especially those of Paul, with breaking violently between the earthly Jesus and the heaven-ascended Savior. As far as the apostolic writings are concerned, we deny the imputation unhesitatingly. Not only does Paul emphasize the great facts in the life of Jesus—his violent death and resurrection from the dead—but he exhorts believers to follow him as he follows Jesus. We need not

stop to say that this following was based on an intimate acquaintance with the Savior's life ; yea, was impossible without it.

But the case is different nowadays as to the practice of the Church. We fear that we do not go far amiss when we say that, of all subjects contained in the Bible, the personal character of Jesus is the most neglected, at least by the religious press and the pulpit.

How wonderfully the infant Jesus was saved from the guilty rage of Herod ; how cogently the boy Jesus reasoned with the doctors of the law ; how powerfully he preached ; how great and how many miracles he wrought ; that he died a most ignominious death, was buried, but rose on the third day and ascended to heaven,—these themes are constantly set forth as *the* Gospel. Now, we would not slight one of them, as we can not dispense with one ; but we can not receive these items, and others that might be added, as the *whole* Gospel. The doctrine of Jesus, of course, is of the highest importance ; but we can not see that this doctrine might not have been delivered by any other divine messenger. The death of Jesus is of the highest moment ; but the doctrine of a vicarious atonement, of a satisfaction made by him, etc., is not only not found in terminology in the New Testament, but its spirit is foreign to it, conveying ideas of God's justice and mercy that are not consistent with the character of the Father of our God and Savior Jesus Christ. Others, again, have made the Church the depository and dispenser of all the merits, the superabundant satisfaction of our Lord and Savior, reserving for Jesus virtually only the office of judge and governor of the world. But we are not aware of any body of professed followers of Jesus, with the exception, perhaps, of the Unitarians, that make the study of Christ's character a Christian's duty.

It can very easily be seen that the loudest professions of loyalty to Jesus may go hand in hand with an entirely unchristian spirit and conduct. As the prophet of Mecca had not been dead many years before his determined enemies had supplanted his descendants, and arrogated to themselves his inheritance, so Jesus has been driven out of their communion by many parties of professed believers, who split hairs in theological questions, determine the relation of three persons in the Godhead to one another—the union of two natures in one person, the proceeding of the Spirit from the Father or the Father and the Son—insist on total depravity and the irresistibility

of grace, and, meanwhile, slander, misrepresent, and persecute all that are not willing to swear on their *verba ipsissima*. Were the personal character of Jesus thoroughly studied and copied, such a fearful state of things could never come to pass in the Church.

The Savior *practiced* his own doctrine, and his conduct shows us the real import of his doctrine. He had laid it down as a law in his kingdom, to love one's enemies; and he himself showed by his example, by his conduct toward his enemies, what it is to love one's enemies. He offered the gospel to them as well as to others; he called their attention to the secret causes of their opposition to him, by laying open the inmost recesses of their hearts, and thus bringing to light their inordinate worldliness, self-righteousness, hypocrisy. When these measures failed of success, he faced them publicly, and administered the most withering rebukes to their national and official sins and crimes; and when their hatred and malice triumphed, when he was hanging on the cross in agony and helplessness, apparently forsaken of God and men, he prayed for them, not for a show, but from love, if by change the hand of retributive justice could be stayed, and thus an opportunity of final salvation be afforded unto them. He had taught his hearers to love their neighbors—every member of the human family; and he showed the import of this command by working incessantly for the amelioration of the physical and spiritual condition of men. His own ease, convenience, comfort, were out of the question. "I have come to seek that which is lost," is a faithful description of his doings, of the set bent of his mind. He had taught the duty of prayer, of exercising a firm trust and confidence in Providence; and he spent nights in prayer and intimate intercourse with his Father, when the wants of an overwrought system loudly called for rest and recreation in sleep.

To study this character as a whole and in detail; to examine not only the outward acts, but to trace them to their sources; never to lose sight of the great end which the actor had proposed to himself, and to which all his individual acts were directed, as they had their origin therein; to study this character in order to copy it, to shape one's own conduct by it,—this we hesitate not to pronounce the chief duty of every professed believer in the Christian religion.

It has been said that the character of Jesus was not perfect; that some duties incumbent on a citizen, as that to take a proper interest

in the prosperity of the State, and especially to yield obedience to the lawful authorities, had been violated by him. Rénan, especially, charges Jesus with a dark fanaticism, inordinate ambition, restiveness under opposition, and a morbid courting of death. But we must say that Mr. Rénan had no adequate conception of Jesus' mission, and was therefore not prepared to understand his conduct. As to the more general charges, they are superficiality itself. Jesus, who gave himself up to the amelioration of the condition of his fellow-men, should have been lacking love of country and patriotism? Do not the individual citizens compose the State? and can the latter suffer while the former prosper? Who can read the heart-rending lamentation over Jerusalem, and say, with any remnant of self-respect, that Jesus was wanting in patriotism?

No! The fact is, the character of Jesus is simply perfect. All real virtues are harmoniously blended therein. There is no excess, no lack, as in all other men, in whom we see virtues deformed by being carried to excess at the expense of other graces. Firm, unshaken confidence in an all-overshadowing Providence, an enthusiastic looking up to God for success, and an indefatigable putting forth of efforts—as if success depended on these alone,—these are some of the apparently contradictory features in the character of Jesus. This character can be understood by him alone who closely studies it, and sincerely strives to imitate it. That such a character is formed, not for time, but for eternity; that, consequently, both the disembodied spirit and the whole man, restored by the indissoluble union of the spirit with the resurrection body, will possess it, may be considered a postulate of reason. Hence, there will be room for the exercise of all Christian virtues, of unflinching confidence and faith, love, activity, work, study, on a larger scale in heaven, throughout the endless ages of eternity, than here on earth; and these practices constitute, in our belief, the employment of the saints in heaven. These are some of the leading features of the Christian character; and *the formation of this character we must pronounce the main, the sole object of this earthly life.*

Do our readers agree with us on this point? We doubt not they do. All parties, even the most arrogant and fanatical, admit this truth impliedly, if not directly. The Roman Catholic, who rigidly performs all the practices enjoined or allowed by his Church; who

hears mass every day, goes to the confessional every Sunday, observes all the prescribed fasts, and abstains from meat altogether; who gets up from his couch in the midst of Winter, at midnight, to go through exercises of penance and self-torture; who lives in voluntary poverty, giving all his property to the Church or the poor,—he will, indeed, hardly admit that he may possibly not be one of God's favorites. But, in the case of another, he will readily grant that a man may do and be all this, and even more, and yet have an unchristian character, and be ultimately lost. So with regard to all other religionists: A man may fancy that he knows time and place, when and where, the Lord spoke peace to his soul, when and where he passed from death unto life, when and where he was converted: he may become "happy" in every meeting; may give a glowing account of how his soul prospers in every class-meeting; may loudly lament the irreligiousness of the times and of his friends, and yet be a castaway—hardly, indeed, in his own opinion, but the more certainly in the estimation of his co-religionists. Another may be baptized by immersion (if this is not a tautological expression); he may commune every Lord's-day, or he may have had the most convincing evidence of his pardon before baptism, and though he may firmly believe in the final perseverance of the saints, others at least, if not himself, readily admit that he may be radically wrong, and be on the road to final perdition.

Common sense and revelation leave no room for any doubt on this point. "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have no charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have no charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity [love], it profiteth me nothing."

Now let us look at the other side of the picture. If we find a man that has the spirit of Christ, and walks in his footsteps continually; if he is sincerely and unostentatiously pious, kind, affectionate, forgiving, withal unconsciously humble, no matter to what sect or party this man belongs, no matter where he worships, all that know him have a more favorable opinion of him than he himself; all readily admit that he is a good man, and express it as their opinion that if

God should ever make an exception in favor of a certain non-conformity, it will be made in favor of that man. Now, if these suppositions are amply warranted by the actual state of things, what follows legitimately? what fair inferences can be drawn from them? That the so-called positive institutions of the gospel are of no importance? that they can be meddled with, with impunity? that the Roman Catholic Church does right in withholding the cup from the so-called laity? that certain temperance parties do right in substituting water or milk for wine in the Supper? that others practice sprinkling, pouring, or effusion, for baptism? By no means. All these practices are inconsistent with a proper respect for the founder of the Christian religion; charge him, indirectly at least, with mistakes; and throw open the flood-gates to the irruption of innovations so wide, that no one can see where the evil will end, or whether Christ's religion will not be radically changed.

That this unauthorized tampering by bodies of religionists will have bad influences on the individual members, by depriving them of the influences which the proper observance of Christ's institutions is intended and designed to exert on all,—this can be psychologically shown, and is therefore subject to no doubt. But the loss thus sustained is for the most part negative and not absolute, but relative; can have, consequently, no influence on the remission of sins, which is in its very nature total, not partial, but retarding the individual's growth in knowledge and grace.

Again: the conduct of most persons in the case before us is perfectly sincere. They may have arrived at their conclusions by a conscientious use of all the means within their reach—searching the Scriptures and prayer: so that they can not act differently without sin. What is not of faith is sin.

If it should be indisputably true that the views held by good people and true lovers of Jesus Christ, in so far as they differ from ours, were false and ours correct, our course of conduct toward them, provided the spirit of Christ animates us, would be plain. We would treat them as erring, weak brethren, but as brethren—as members of the same body, of which we are members, and of which Jesus Christ is the glorious head; we would do them all the good in our power, bearing always in mind that our own responsibility is commensurate with our higher privileges.



But this assumption is not likely to be invariably true. The probability, on the contrary, is great that we are as much in error as they; at least, in so far as we differ from others, they are likely to believe us to be in error. Hence, it is a clear duty to be charitable in our judgment on the views of others, that we may not be found in the end to have fought against the truth. The positions here taken would, on the whole, be correct, even if the New Testament religion were a system of certain truths firmly to be held by every believer, and a code of laws conscientiously to be performed by all. This we conceive, indeed, to be the opinion of many professed believers; this is at least the most charitable view we can take of their case, in order to account for their otherwise often strange conduct.

The Roman Catholic believes that the New Testament and what he calls tradition, contain, in the form of formulated propositions, the whole Christian system. The Lutheran, rejecting merely tradition, believes virtually the same, and is firmly persuaded that all he has to believe is laid down with philosophical precision in the two Catechisms of Luther, the unchanged "Augustana" and the "Formula Concordiæ." The Reformed of the European Continent holds in equal esteem the "Heidelberg Catechism" and the Decrees of Dort. The Episcopalian has no doubt that a firm adherence to the Thirty-nine Articles, the "Book of Common Prayer," and the sacraments administered by a priest in the regular line, constitute the only true Christian; while the Episcopal Methodist yields a ready obedience, from fear of forfeiting all claims on heaven, to the quadrennially made and unmade rules of his General Conference. But is this view of Christianity correct, or is it false, both in details and on the whole? We give it as our conviction that it is false. If true faith were the adherence to a creed, confession of faith, body of divinity, we should surely find this creed, confession, or what it may be called, in the New Testament; and if any man was ever qualified to write such a system, Paul the apostle was. But neither he nor any of his fellow-apostles has attempted any thing of the kind. If there is a book in the New Testament that bears a distant resemblance to a system of didactic theology, it is Paul's Epistle to the Romans. But how widely does even this glorious document differ, both in form and contents, from human creeds!

But there is positive proof that the religion which the New Testament teaches does not consist in holding certain articles of faith, and

in obeying certain positive and moral laws. We see in the spiritual life of the authors of the New Testament a constant progress. Paul alone seems to have arrived at once at something like a correct understanding of the nature and end of the gospel, although even in his case there must have been a progress, a filling out of the general sketch of the picture. In the case of Peter, we can distinctly trace a progressive comprehension of the gospel. A vision removes his scruples to hold intercourse with non-Jews. At the apostolic council he advocates the more developed and liberal views of Paul; but not very long afterward he goes back on his own views, and gives the sanction of his own example to views which, if they had prevailed, would have shorn Christianity of its specific character, and degraded its followers to a Jewish sect. On a level with Paul stands John; and of the two other New Testament writers, we do not know that they ever attained to the Pauline or Johnean insight into the gospel. These facts—and only the blind can fail to see them—are inconsistent with the view of Christianity under consideration. If this view were correct, the different stand-points held by the apostles would contain errors, positive errors, not consistent with any kind of inspiration granted to the writers of the books of the New Testament. This seems to have been felt early; and an inspiration, a literal inspiration, was claimed, which forbid the study of the sacred books as reflecting the mental status of the writers. But all this is erroneous. Christianity is the power of a higher life, flowing from the glorified Redeemer into the believer, and carrying with it all the blessings God has in store for a fallen race. Into the same intimate relation in which we find ourselves to the first Adam by our natural birth, we enter by faith to the second Adam, becoming thereby partakers of his own personal life. This life-union with the Savior carries with it a full pardon of all sins and the germs of a new life. These germs, however, must be developed, they must expand, affecting and sanctifying in their development the whole man. This development is the work, not of a moment, but of a life-time. This is effected not without great struggles. The old man must not only be killed, but be crucified; that is, it dies slowly and painfully. The notion of a second work of grace, destroying in a moment man's sinful nature, and bringing about a moral status or condition like that enjoyed by Adam before the Fall, has no foundation in the Scriptures, reason, and experience, and must be considered as a delusion of a morbid state of

the mind, leading to the most deplorable consequences if carried out. But the dying of the old man is only one part of this great work: the rising of the new man, created after God in righteousness and true holiness, is the second and positive part of this work. The acme of perfection is the life of Jesus; his spirit, his mind, must become the controlling, the only principle of action, making our relations to God, to the world, to our fellow-men, virtually like his. In order to accomplish this great end, we are furnished with all the means necessary: we have the Word of God, and in it the character of Jesus Christ, which we must read, study, and make the man of our counsel; we have a free access by prayer to the throne of God, being thus enabled to come at all times before our Heavenly Father, engaging in sweet conversation with him, laying our joys and griefs, our victories and defeats, our wants before him, and receiving always according to our faith. We have public and social worship, where we meet not only the brethren and sisters, and are edified by their piety, and stimulated to new and stronger efforts by their zeal, but we meet there another attendant, who is never missing, except where the spirit of the worshipers makes it impossible for him to be present; namely, Jesus himself, who has positively promised to be present wherever two or three are gathered together in his name. We have prayer in the closet, to which the greatest blessings, answers to all our petitions and supplications, are positively promised.

Then we have the two great ordinances—baptism and the Lord's-supper; the one the door of entrance into the kingdom, by submitting to which the believing recipient is constituted a subject of God's kingdom, with all the privileges pertaining thereto, and with all the means of grace enabling him to discharge the duties growing out of his new relation. The other ordinance, the Lord's-supper, is not merely a lively memorial of Christ's dying love of mankind, but the means in and through which Jesus gives himself to the believer, feeding and nourishing his soul unto everlasting life.

These are some of the main features of Christianity, both objectively and subjectively considered, as we understand it; and we are of the opinion that when the New Testament is read and studied, with a sincere desire of learning its contents, and conforming thoughts and conduct to it, this view will, in its main features, be reached.

But have we a right to say, or even to think, that when different conclusions are reached by others, through studying the Scriptures, this their study is not of the right kind? We dare say that we have no such right. We do not know men's motives; hence, we must not impugn them. Jesus and his apostles dealt very mildly with all those that labored under errors of judgment, but were really sincere; and their examples ought to be for us a norm of conduct.

As we have seen, uniformity of views in believers is not only not necessary, but is even an impossibility. Christianity is a new life, destroying only what is really sinful in man, but preserving, purifying, and sanctifying every genuine element of humanity in individuals; and as these elements differ, not in kind but in degree, men's views and notions, of necessity, differ. There are, however, principles advocated in the New Testament in which sincere readers can not differ, as the testimony of infidels, Jews, and others, proves, who, indeed, did not believe in the Divine origin of the Book, but agreed, in their judgment as to the teachings of the Book, with the generality of Christians. We find, likewise, that for three centuries the Christian Churches agreed, of course, on the main facts connected with the Christian religion, but differed widely on many points, and these by no means of subordinate importance.

It strikes us that the setting up of uniformity of views as a test of soundness of faith and a bond of union, is an egregious blunder, from beginning to end; defeating, if consistently carried out, the very object of God's purposes concerning the individual man and the race. Not that we attach no importance to correct views—for the connection between intellect and will is so close that the one is greatly influenced and modified by the other—but we consider this unreasonable stress laid on uniformity of views not only as arbitrary, but as turning men's attention away from the one thing needful, as fostering the worst passions of our nature—contentiousness, uncharitableness, etc. Moreover, this violence done to the human conscience, to human reason, retards most effectually the growth in grace and knowledge. We know that to set up a proper test is no easy task, and every effort put forth in this direction seems to have proved a failure. Still, we think that faith in the Christ, and obedience to his commandments, express terms of fellowship that ought to be acceptable to all.

## LITERARY NOTICES.

## HOME LITERATURE.

## BOOKS.

- 1.—*Modern Doubt and Christian Belief.* A Series of Apologetic Lectures addressed to Earnest Seekers after Truth. By THEODORE CHRISTLIEB, D. D., University Preacher and Professor of Theology at Bonn. Translated, with the author's sanction, chiefly by the Rev. H. U. WEITBRECHT, Ph. D., and edited by the Rev. T. L. KINGSBURY, M. A., Vicar of Easton Royal, and Rural Dean. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati; Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 8vo. pp. 549.

ERROR is always a variable quantity. Truth is ever gaining new victories, but error never fails to make a masterly retreat. No sooner are the enemies of truth routed from one position than they gather up their scattered ranks and form a new line of operations, both offensive and defensive. Infidelity has been beaten upon a thousand battle-fields of its own choosing; but it is still finding new positions, and still fighting with a desperation worthy of a better cause.

The friends of truth must not trust too implicitly in past successes. Their wily foe must not be allowed to rest. The war must be carried into Africa, and waged with relentless energy until every stronghold of skepticism is completely demolished.

Modern doubt is not the old-fashioned kind, at least, in form. It is virtually the same thing, but it does not appear the same. It means the same, but does not read the same. It is the same in principle; it differs only in method. But this difference in method requires a different method of apologetics. We can not meet the new phases of infidelity with the old arguments of Paley, Watson, etc. No one seems to understand this matter better than Professor Christlieb. Hence, he has written a work which is specially designed to meet the skepticism of to-day.

The first lecture frankly acknowledges that there is a breach between modern culture and Christianity. The causes of this breach are declared to be historical, scientific, ecclesiastical, political, social, and ethical. Each of these causes is treated with a thoroughness and candor which can not fail to command the respect of even those who will not accept the Professor's conclusions.

Under causes ecclesiastical, the Professor gives us a very gloomy picture of the past and present of the Church herself. He declares that it was the corruptions, the growing moral corruptions, of the Church on the one hand, and the enslavement of men's minds in the bondage of the letter on the other, that led so many noble spirits into doubt as to the truth of Christianity during the Middle Ages; and so it came to pass that, "under the shadow of an iron scholasticism, a scarcely disguised infidelity had gradually developed itself, and in the very metropolis of mediæval Christianity, Rome itself, broke out occasionally into open mobbery." Similar causes are at work in the Roman Catholic Church of to-day, and, to the extent of their influence, are widening the breach between culture and Christianity.

But the case is not much better when we turn to Protestantism. "What was it," asks the Professor, "that in the last century prepared the way among ourselves for the prevalence of rationalism? Was it not the petrifaction of evangelical faith in the dry forms of orthodoxy, accompanied by an almost total cessation of all further efforts for the diffusion of the Gospel?" He further declares that "the sermons of that period were for the most part dry expositions of particular doctrines, accompanied by vehement attacks, not only on other Churches, but also on many in one's own Church, who happened to differ on some point or other from the confessional standards; for example, on Crypto-Calvinists, Syncretists, Synergists, Majorists, Antinomians, Osiandrians, Weigelians, and Arminians, etc., making one's head swim with the bare enumeration of the various 'isms' which the preacher felt himself called upon to denounce."

Professor Christlieb does not hesitate to blame the Protestantism of the last century for the skepticism of such men as Schiller, etc. He adds: "How could it be otherwise, when the Protestant Church was fairly stiff with a cold morality, and when all spiritual life and fervor had departed?" Let us hear him still further:

"But, to come nearer to our own time, the Church of the present is also, in this respect, not free from blame. Even now, in England, where for ages past faith has struck its strongest roots in the very heart of the common people, and still retains in great measure its hold upon them, doubts and skeptical theories are rapidly spreading. Resting on the so-called 'evidences of Christianity,' the Church of England in the last century has fallen, as we all know, into a deep slumber. From that slumber she has indeed long awakened; but it is now to contemplate with alarm her own impotence to withstand assaults, from which the old 'evidences' afford no longer adequate protection. She finds now that theological training has been too long neglected in her great universities, and the vast majority of her clergy quite inadequately furnished for encountering the attacks of modern criticism. Many will not acknowledge this to themselves, while others of a nobler temper rush in hot haste to translations from the German, in order to make themselves *au fait* in questions stirred by the Colenso and other 'Broad Church' controversies. The want of experienced leaders through the thickest labyrinths of modern criticism is painfully felt; and many, in consequence, are seen heedlessly rushing on toward the most dangerous precipices of critical skepticism. Others, starting back in terror, seek in the communion of Rome a refuge from infidelity. Others, again—and these naturally form the great majority—still



thoughtlessly cleave to the bare letter of Scripture and their Church formularies, and think to intrench themselves behind these paper fortifications in a vain security from the importations of German theology and critical science. By such persons a grossly exaggerated and thoroughly unevangelical view of the nature of inspiration is often made use of to decide off-hand on critical or scientific questions, which ought to be discussed on their own merits, and by no means interfere with the foundations of Christian faith. And so, also, needless appeals to legal tribunals to decide on points where spiritual and intellectual weapons ought rather to be used, are calculated not to heal, but only to widen the breach between science and Christianity. To raise, moreover, mere questions of detail in the present controversies between natural science and theology into articles of faith, and give them an importance which is by no means assigned to them in Holy Scriptures, is surely the very way to excite in many minds a not inexcusable indignation at such attempts at intellectual tyranny, but which is too apt itself to degenerate into total indifference toward any claims of Divine revelation. The Church itself, and her one-sidedness, is here chiefly to blame.

"Things are somewhat better in Germany. The Church here has certainly avoided some of these mistakes. She has not set herself in opposition to theological and scientific inquiry; perhaps has rather been too lax in duly limiting it. She has, on the whole, followed the maxim of meeting opponents on their own ground, and withstanding them with merely scientific weapons; and this course has resulted in a victorious advance of evangelical theology, despite the most formidable opposition, to a firmer, closer hold of the fundamental principles of the ancient faith. But here our commendation stops. The German Protestant Church has fallen into other faults and errors, not less injurious than those of her English sister. She has favored the advance of unbelief among her own people by quietly looking on when she ought to have been up and doing. In the eyes of many, she has seemed to regard her own cause as lost. She has too long neglected a duty much better attended to in England—that of encountering the skeptical popular literature of the day by popular religious journals, tracts, and magazines, in which assaults on Christianity were duly met and answered. It is only quite recently that our Church has seriously set herself, by a revived apologetic literature, to recover the ground thus lost."

This picture is certainly dark enough; but when we add the influence of scientific, political, social, and ethical causes, it is almost a matter of wonder that Christianity has made any headway at all. We think it will scarcely be denied that modern rationalism is not so much a protest against Christianity itself as against the perversions of Christianity, which are now passing for the original. It is the article manufactured at Trent, Augsburg, Westminster, etc., that is in the mind of modern infidels when they are making their most determined attack upon the faith of Christendom. Professor Christlieb properly starts the question "whether *true* culture and *genuine* Christianity mutually exclude one another, or whether, on the contrary, the latter does not produce, or at any rate promote, the former." Surely, there ought to be no antagonism between these two. But a false culture will find fault with a genuine Christianity, while a false Christianity will, in turn, find fault with a true culture. In seeking how the breach may be filled up between modern culture and Christianity, he gives us his view of what is false in both, and demands that it shall be rigorously excluded. In treating of what is false in Christianity, he is not as specific as we could wish. It is not enough to point out a few mistakes which the Church has made, either in its creed or in its practice. What is needed is a complete restoration of primitive Christianity, in letter and

spirit, in faith and practice. It is easy enough to meet the sophistries of infidelity; for almost any kind of Christianity can be defended against the plea of no religion at all. But, to completely overthrow the hosts of modern skepticism, we must "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints."

Professor Christlieb has performed a noble work in the volume before us. He has generally treated his opponents fairly, and, although he has not always thoroughly vanquished them, he has certainly done much to fill up the breach which now exists between modern culture and Christianity. The following will give the key-note of all he has written. Every sentence is worthy to be seriously studied:

"If any true reconciliation is to be effected, it must rather be accomplished,—First, by a genuine apprehension of Christianity in this its divine foolishness, which is wiser than men, *its divine nucleus and center*, Christ himself, the Eternal Son; and in its perfect purity, beauty, and truth, *bearing its own witness to every human heart*, and faithfully presented to the world. Secondly, by a genuine apprehension of the true nature and value of culture and science, their ennobling, moral tendency in the formation of heart and character, and not merely of the intellect; and, thirdly, by the bringing home to the consciousness of men in general *the inward affinity of this tendency with that of true Christianity*. The Gospel, freed from the disfigurements inflicted upon it by the prejudice of friends, and the misunderstanding of opponents, must again be brought home to the mind and conscience of our age as the only sure basis of all true popular culture, and once more made *intelligible to the genius of the nineteenth century*, so as to impart to the educated classes of the present day, with all their perverted and over-stimulated tastes, a feeling and an interest for divine truth. This result will not be effected by a paring down or total rejection of the germ of Gospel truth, but by developing this germ, and by disclosing to men's hearts its inward spring of life. Only let the Church hold fast Him who is her foundation and her end—Christ; *only let her proclaim him, not with the old merely, but also with new tongues*. Let her be mindful to present him to the present age, with its needs of culture, not merely in his *divine glory*, but also in his *human beauty* and moral purity; and to exhibit the free grace and love of God manifested in him not merely as *indispensable*, but also as *all-sufficient*, to a world feverishly agitated, and in every sphere of knowledge and action wearily excited, and as the only true source of peace, and the only power which can permanently satisfy the deepest needs of human nature. These vital characteristics of the Gospel have for many centuries wonderfully attracted hearts and minds, and the more purely and plainly it was set forth, the greater was the power it exercised; and this attraction it will retain until the end of time.

"The ultimate answer to all questions, the solution of all doubts, is contained in Him who is the mystery of all mysteries, the revelation of revelations; that is, in Christ, the Light of the world. If Christendom, now in so many ways Christless, is brought back to a *contemplation of Christ*, false prejudices will soon vanish, and the contradictions between knowledge and faith will begin to be solved, and from this light beams will issue which will gradually illuminate even the darkest mysteries, or insure the certainty of a future enlightenment. When that is the case, the inward schism of which we have spoken is already overcome, and the breach closes of itself.

"We can not, indeed, expect, and more especially if we accept the testimony of Holy Scripture, that the breach will speedily be healed in regard to *all*. No one, indeed, will wish to deny that in our modern culture there is much that is false, egotistic and selfish; much that is misleading and exaggerated, and consequently opposed to true culture. Against these untrue elements of culture, Christianity will and must always take the field; it must not oppose progress, although it is at all times bound to show itself hostile to the *sins* of progress, just as, from its very commencement, it has always testified and striven against such sins. *Between Christless culture and Christianity a bridge of accommodation*

*can no more be built than between light and darkness; and woe to him who undertakes this!* But whatever in our modern culture is thoroughly *Christless*, and therefore godless, is unworthy of the name, and can therefore claim from us no further consideration. It is mere naked rudeness and selfishness, ill-disguised by the gaudy rags of outward decency; a mere cherishing of the sensual nature, which, left to itself, would soon degenerate into monstrous barbarism, of which we already see many indications. See, for instance, how fearfully the thirst for gold unchristianizes and demoralizes men, and how much internal rudeness and want of moral discipline are thereby fostered in the face of all external and apparent culture! With moral failings of this kind—which are, alas! closely blended with the culture of the present day—the spirit of Christianity can never be reconciled. To overcome these failings, we need, as we have previously recognized, a high degree of mental resolution; and he who is not capable of this, will never be able to embrace even the purest form of Christianity; indeed, the more purely Christianity presents itself to such a one, the more direct will be the antagonism in which he finds himself placed toward it.”

- 2.—*Problems of Life and Mind*. By GEORGE HENRY LEWES. First Series. The Foundations of a Creed. Vol. I. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 8vo. pp. 434.

THE author of this volume claims that he has hit upon the true method with which to treat all metaphysical questions. He thinks that this method, when properly applied, will bring harmony out of the confusion which has so long reigned over the metaphysical domain. This should certainly be welcome news to us; for in no department of investigation has there been so little that is satisfactory achieved as in the department styled *Metaphysics*.

The new method is very simple. It is the scientific method applied to metaphysics, or, more properly, it is metaphysics brought down to the sphere of physical science; for it is claimed that there ought to be no distinction between science and metaphysics so far as method is concerned. Kant affirmed a distinction with great emphasis, while Hegel treats science by the method of metaphysics.

With the new method we can never invoke aid from any other source higher than experience; consequently, we must “discard all inquiries that transcend the ascertained, or ascertainable, data of experience.” Hence the necessity for a new word which will clearly designate this “discarded remainder.” Our author thinks the word *metempirical* sufficiently characterizes the nature of the inquiries rejected, since the word *empirical* designates the province we include in the range of science. He says:

“The terms empiricism, empiricist, empirical, although commonly employed by metaphysicians with contempt, to mark a mode of investigation which admits no higher source than experience (by them often unwarrantably restricted to sensation), may be accepted without demur, since even the flavor of contempt only serves to emphasize the distinction. There will, perhaps, be an equivalent contempt in the minds of positive thinkers attaching to the term *metempirical*; but since this term is the exact correlative of *empirical*, and designates whatever lies beyond the limits of possible experience, it characterizes inquiries which one class regards as vain and futile, another as exalted above mere scientific

procedure. Nor is this the only advantage of the term; it also detaches from metaphysics a vast range of insoluble problems, leaving behind it only such as are soluble.

"Thus whatever conceptions can be reached *through logical extensions of experience*, and can be shown to be *conformable with it*, are legitimate products, capable of being used as principles for further research. On the contrary, whatever lies beyond the limits of experience, and claims another origin than that of induction and deduction from established data, is illegitimate. It can never become a principle of research, but only an object of infertile debate. The metempirical region is the void where speculation roams unchecked, where sense has no footing, where experiment can exercise no control, and where calculation ends in impossible quantities. In short, physics and metaphysics deal with things and their relations, as these are known to us and as they are believed to exist in our universe; metemprics sweeps out of this region in search of the *otherness* of things. Seeking to behold things, not as they are in our universe, not as they are to us, it substitutes for the ideal constructions of science the ideal constructions of imagination."

In chapter iii, we have this new method more fully explained. It is there declared that this experimental method is "by no means restricted to that enumeration of particulars and classification of sensations which is assumed to be its scope by those philosophers which villify it under the name of empiricism, and those rhetors who declaim against it as dealing with nothing but what can be seen and felt." It is declared to be the "methodizing that which is known," and the "range of what is known comprehends much more than the sensible." Hence, "not only the direct presentations to sense, but the indirect representations—the verifiable inferences from sense—constitute its elements." No matter what the object of research may be—whether nature, man, or society in general, or some special group of their phenomena—three aspects are always presented: First, the *positive* or known; second, the *speculative* or unknown, though knowable; third, the *unknowable*. The first two are declared to be empirical, the third is metempirical. The first two rest either on direct sensation and verified inference, or on intuition and logical deductions from intuition, which are verifiable by direct or indirect reduction to sensation. The third rests on no such basis, and is therefore distinguishable from the two former in kind, not simply in degree. Our author illustrates:

"Suppose the object investigated is the motion of the heavenly bodies. The first step is to determine the positive, or known, elements of the question; namely, that all the planets move round the sun in the same direction and in nearly the same plane, and that, inasmuch as their orbits are nearly circular, they describe paths which are parallel. This general plane of circulation is very nearly the plane of the sun's equator. The same facts are ascertained respecting the motion of the satellites round their planets, although their equators have various inclinations to the plane of the sun's equator. This leads to the inference that the two circulations of planets and satellites, although independent as facts, depend on the same principle, and have a common origin. What is that? This question brings forward the speculative aspect. The principle sought can not be seen, it must be deduced. Speculation is seeing with the mind's eye what is not present to sense or to intuition. It is ideal construction, and begins with conjecture—too often, alas! ending where it began.

"The satellites present also another remarkable law, their rotation on their own axes being executed in the same time as their rotation round their planets (hence, we always see the same face of the moon). This law is positive; it is the observed order. But the cause

that is, that it depends on tidal friction in the satellite while it was still in motion—is at present speculative.

"Suppose, now, the astronomer, after expounding the positive and speculative aspects of the planetary motions, is led to expound his conception of the *purpose* which these laws were intended to fulfill in creation, and his estimate of the wisdom and benevolence in so disposing them, and not otherwise, is it not obvious that, in this teleological explanation, he quits the ground of experience to enter on that region where all sensible data and all verifiable inferences vanish? His conjectures on this point may be approximately right or absurdly wrong; no possible means of determining whether they are right or wrong exist. If he regard them as no more than subjective fancies wherewith to satisfy his own feelings, we can not object. But if he regards them as in any degree entering into astronomical science; and if he permits any deductions from them to modify the positive and speculative data, or in any way to modify the course of astronomical thought, he violates the first principle of method, by suffering the empirical to be controlled by the metempirical, and allowing the unknowable to distort the known."

We have quoted thus freely, because we wish to give our author's position a fair statement. Mr. Lewes claims much for the cause of truth in the application of his method of investigation. He has certainly written out his views with marked ability, and we shall look with considerable interest for the appearance of the volumes which are to follow. When we have the whole discussion before us, we will endeavor to give a fuller account of this new *principia*, which proposes to lay Newton on the shelf, and reorganize all our books on mental science.

---

3.—*Forgiveness and Law, Grounded in Principles Interpreted by Human Analogies.* By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 12mo. pp. 256.

A NEW book from Dr. Bushnell, on almost any subject, would likely attract attention. But the volume before us will be sure to receive unusual attention. It is an effort to re-state the doctor's views of the atonement, as expressed in his "Vicarious Sacrifice." It has been known for some time that the doctor was not satisfied with what he had written upon the Atonement, and that he has had the whole subject under reconsideration. We now have, in "Forgiveness and Law," the results of this re-examination. The doctor has evidently changed ground considerably; and yet he is not much nearer, if any, the orthodox view than he was before. In his first statement he maintained that the sacrifice of Christ produced its effects wholly on the moral nature of man; that God was in no particular changed by it; and that when the Scriptures speak of him as being propitiated, we have only a figure of speech, by which objective and subjective meanings are freely exchanged. In the latter statement, however, this notion is exchanged for the theory that a real propitiation is wrought in the Divine nature. The following will show how this doctrine is to be interpreted:

"There is, it is true, one great principle, or fundamental fact, which runs through the whole subject as presented, and is, in a sense, the universal solvent of it; but that will not

be seen at any single glance, and can not bring God into the range of a probable partaker-ship with us in the necessities of propitiation till it has been long enough canvassed to reveal what is in it. The fact of which I speak is the grand analogy, or almost identity, that subsists between our moral nature and that of God; so that our moral pathologies and those of God make faithful answer to each other, and he is brought so close to us that almost any thing that occurs in the workings or exigencies of our moral instincts may even be expected in his."

It is claimed that, in the New Testament, forgiveness of men and forgiveness of God are set forth mutually, one by the help of the other. Hence, the fundamental idea of the Book is, that, since man is made in the image of God, the moral nature of man is the best guide in the study of God's moral government. Such passages of Scripture as teach us how to treat each other, enable us to understand the dealings of God toward his creatures. By becoming acquainted with *human* government, we may next rise to a just apprehension of the *Divine* government.

"Finding, in this manner, how our moral nature, as such, becomes alienated and averted from them that do us wrong and trample the rights of others, and how it tones itself to a completely forgiving state only by acts of cost or sacrifice which are, in proper verity, propitiations of itself, it should not surprise us to find the analogy running far enough to comprehend all other moral natures, even the highest. And here, as I conceive, we get our initiatory point for the true understanding of the Christian propitiation. We have only to go back on the pathologies of our own moral nature, to make the discovery that we ourselves instinctively make sacrifice to gain our adversary, in doing which we also gain ourselves. I said that we do it instinctively; but I only mean that our moral instincts are so far cast in this mold as to induce this kind of action, when we are in the highest key of supernatural life and exaltation. I wish I could believe that we are always in this key; for it is the infelicity of my argument, in this great subject, that I am required to hang it on a fact which, alas! too many have no witness of in their own experience; and my fear is, that the analogy I suggest will be quite insignificant to them, because they run their life on so low a key, and make it so nearly selfish, that the exalted consciousness, which is itself so near akin to God, is not on hand to second what I say. How shall it seem reasonable, or even properly intelligent, to propose the verification of God's way in forgiveness by our own, or the fact of his propitiation in order to his forgiveness by the propitiation we instinctively make ready in our own, when the mind that is addressed lives in no element of forgiveness and propitiation, and has nothing in experience to make so high an ascription seem any thing better than a dull extravagance? Let the caution here given be taken without offense.

"Still it will be something for such to observe how expressly, and even formally, the indorsement of revelation is given us for just this free appeal to the human analogies. Thus, when Christ requires us to forgive as God forgives, his apostle turns the doctrine boldly round, requiring us to forgive 'even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven us.' By these words, 'for Christ's sake,' (*en Christo*, or in Christ,) he does not mean, as many understand, on the ground of satisfaction made by Christ—for we plainly enough can not make satisfaction for the sin of our enemy—but he means that we are to forgive, as volunteering in the cost of sacrifice, after Christ's example. Indeed, there could be no forgiveness in God on the ground of satisfaction; it would only be his admission that nothing is any longer due."

A second important point is made concerning the relation of Christ to law. A distinction is made between law and commandment. One is declared to be the impersonal idea of right as expressed in statutory regulations, the other the personal rule of a trusted superior. One is addressed



to reason and conscience, the other to faith. One finds its sanctions in the consciousness of right, the other in personal authority. One is hedged about with penalties, the other is full of precious promises.

It is scarcely probable that the doctor's new statement will be much more satisfactory than the old one was. In fact, we do not hope for any entirely satisfactory statement concerning the matter of which he writes; still we confess that our sympathies are with him in his earnest attempt to place the doctrine of the atonement upon such grounds as that the moral sense of men shall not rebel against it. The orthodox view has long been *felt* to be very unsatisfactory; hence, while many may not be disposed to follow Dr. Bushnell's logic, not many, we think, will fail to see that his struggles for light are in the right direction when he says, "Our present state of life, or probation, is a state of penally coercive discipline, in which the law, broken by sin, is sufficiently consecrated by Christ, incarnated into and co-operating with it in his life and cross."

---

4.—*What is Darwinism?* By CHARLES HODGE, Princeton, N. J. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 12mo. pp. 178.

THIS little volume goes into the Darwinian theory *con amore*. Dr. Hodge is a controversialist, and, withal, a theologian. With these antecedents, we might conclude, *a priori*, that the doctor would not let Darwinism pass. It was a lucky thing for Hodge that Darwin wrote. It gives the doctor such a good opportunity to add "a few more last words" after closing up his Systematic Theology. No one will question Dr. Hodge's ability; but we think his fairness may be very properly questioned. He is too frequently a special pleader; and, like all men who ardently enter the field of polemics, he does not always do justice to his opponent, while he frequently overstates the value of arguments intended to support his own side of the question.

The present volume opens with a discussion of different theories as to the origin of the universe, and especially animal and vegetable organisms. First, the Scriptural theory; second, the Pantheistic theory; third, the Epicurean theory; fourth, the doctrine of Herbert Spencer; fifth, Hylozoic theory; sixth, unscriptural forms of Theism. Then follow a statement and discussion of Darwin's theory: First, as regards the origin of the fauna and flora of our earth; and, secondly, as regards the animal kingdom. The various animals, with man, having descended from the primordial animalculæ, he thinks may be accounted for by the following natural laws. We give Dr. Hodge's summary:

"First. The Law of Heredity, or that by which like begets like. The offspring are like the parent.

"*Second.* The Law of Variation; that is, while the offspring are, in all essential characteristics like their immediate progenitor, they nevertheless vary, more or less, within narrow limits, from their parent and from each other. Some of these variations are indifferent, some deteriorations, some improvements; that is, they are such as enable the plant or animal to exercise its functions to greater advantage.

"*Third.* The Law of Over-production. All plants and animals tend to increase in a geometrical ratio, and therefore tend to overrun enormously the means of support. If all the seeds of a plant, all the spawn of a fish, were to arrive at maturity, in a very short time the world could not contain them; hence, of necessity, arises a struggle for life. Only a few of the myriads born can possibly live.

"*Fourth.* Here comes in the Law of Natural Selection, or the Survival of the Fittest. That is, if any individual of a given species of plant, or animal, happens to have a slight deviation from the normal type, favorable to its success in the struggle for life, it will survive. This variation, by the Law of Heredity, will be transmitted to its offspring, and by them again to theirs. Soon these favored ones gain the ascendancy, and the less favored perish; and the modification becomes established in the species. After a time, another and another of such favorable variations occur, with like results. Thus, very gradually, great changes of structure are introduced, and not only species, but genera, families, and orders, in the vegetable and animal world, are produced."

Following this statement of the Darwinian theory, we have some pretty vigorous writing setting forth Darwinism as not a very lovely thing. It is first shown, from Darwin's own writings, that he denies teleology, and then extracts are given from such advocates of his theory as Russell Wallace, Professor Huxley, Dr. Büchner, Carl Vogt, Professor Haeckel, and Strauss, which go to establish the same conclusion. Then the opponents of Darwinism are appealed to. The Duke of Argyll, Agassiz, Professor Jenet, M. Flourens, Reverend Walter Mitchell, and Principal Dawson, are placed upon the witness stand. These all testify, with singular unanimity, that Darwin is guilty of the fearful crime with which he is charged. Now, to deny teleology is enough to place any man under condemnation. We, therefore, give our vote that Darwin should be condemned.

The chapter on "The Relation of Darwinism to Religion" is, to our mind, far from being satisfactory. We do not think that Darwinism necessarily affects religion at all; and although it may logically involve atheism, as Dr. Hodge concludes, still we do not believe that it will ever practically amount to much either for or against religious life, even though the theory were generally accepted.

Dr. Hodge's arguments against Darwinism are generally strong, and sometimes simply irresistible. Mr. Darwin's theory, in its essential facts, evidently lacks proof, and Dr. Hodge shows, we think, with sufficient clearness, this weakness. But the doctor is a theologian, not a naturalist, and must therefore seek to save his theology, no matter whether Darwinism is true or not. Hence, the *odium theologicum* is at last presented as the cure for this pestiferous theory.

Now, we wish to say that we simply have no faith in Mr. Darwin's conclusions; but we have just as little faith in that method of reasoning which

makes one thing false because we desire that something else shall be true. Darwinism claims to be the teaching of science; let it, therefore, be scientifically refuted, and let theology take care of itself.

- 
- 5.—*Life of Elder Walter Scott*: with Sketches of his Fellow-laborers, William Hayden, Adamson Bentley, John Henry, and others. By WILLIAM BAXTER. Cincinnati: Bosworth, Chase & Hall. 1874. 12mo. pp. 450.

WE have in this volume another evidence that, "if we write in haste, we may repent at leisure." The materials were abundant for a fresh and instructive *Life of Walter Scott*. Men and women are still living, at nearly all the places where he resided, who knew him intimately. Had the author of this volume gone to these persons, with pencil in hand, and given us their story in their own style, we should have had a book of much more value than we now have. No one need expect to have furnished to hand the materials he needs for writing a faithful biography. Cards published in a paper, calling for help, may be responded to by a few; but even these will fail to give much of the information that is needed. Doubtless Mr. Baxter availed himself, to some extent, of the method we have suggested, but evidently not far enough to make his work as complete as it ought to be. This is partly what we mean by saying that he has written hastily. To have done his work well, he ought to have had not less than six or seven years for the sole purpose of gathering materials. But there are also marks of haste in the composition. The sentences are frequently involved, and sometimes the most palpable mistakes in grammar are noticeable. These are things that ought not to appear in a book of this kind; and we can not believe they would have appeared, had it not been for an undue haste in getting the book before the public.

We call attention to another defect, which may be regarded as simply a matter of taste. We refer to the Introduction. We think this will be judged as very unusual in a work of this kind. Mr. Baxter certainly had a right to give us, in a Preface, such a statement as would explain his own connection with the work, how he came to write it, etc. This he does, and so far all is well. But when he asks us, after this Preface, to wade through an Introduction of seventeen pages before we come to the beginning of *Scott's Life*, he taxes our patience considerably. We have no complaint to make of the Introduction itself. It is a very respectable essay, and, in its proper place, as in an appendix, or, what would be better, distributed through the "*Life*," it would be useful matter. But where it is, it is simply William Baxter, and not Walter Scott; and this is just what we do not want in a *Life of Walter Scott*.

We have noticed these imperfections, not because they are very damaging, but because the time has come when our literature should challenge the

highest respect. The Disciples have given the world several biographies; but we think we are justified in saying that President Williams's "Life of John Smith" is the only one that approaches a true ideal.

In saying what we have, we do not wish to be understood as finding fault with the main features of Mr. Baxter's book. In many respects he has done nobly. In using the material which he had, he has generalized facts with marked ability, while his portraitures of men and things are very vivid, and happily drawn. Sometimes we come upon passages of rare beauty in composition, and, were it not for the slight imperfections already alluded to, we could say that the style is always flowing and easy.

In the closing chapters we are led to infer that the causes which hastened Mr. Scott's death were, chiefly, the political troubles of the country. Doubtless these troubles had their influence upon him; but the writer of this notice, knowing Mr. Scott well at that time, and seeing him frequently at his own home, is of the opinion that the true cause is not given in Mr. Baxter's biography.

The work will be read with unusual interest by many old friends and associates of Mr. Scott, while those who are seeking for a clear and satisfactory statement of the rise and progress of the religious movement in which Mr. Scott was engaged, can not do better than to read carefully this volume.

---

6.—*Sex and Education.* A Reply to Dr. E. H. Clarke's "Sex in Education."

Edited, with an Introduction, by MRS. JULIA WARD HOWE. Boston: Roberts Bros. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 16mo. pp. 203.

THERE is considerable amount of vigorous writing in this little volume. Evidently Dr. Clarke's book touched some tender places; and, hence, these reviews of it are generally written in that nervous style which is usually characteristic of injured innocence.

Mrs. Julia Ward Howe leads off in a style which is fairly the key-note of all that follows. She leaves a half conviction upon the mind that, in her opinion, a critical flagellation is not all that the doctor needs; a little physical agitation of the doctor's cuticle would at least afford a healthy exercise.

It is useless to deny that many of the points in this volume made against Dr. Clarke are strong ones, and are not to be set aside because of the somewhat nervous excitement with which they are made. It is well to hear both sides of every question; and as the question of female education is just now assuming unusual importance, it is certainly well to have all the phases of the subject thoroughly discussed. The following from the Introduction presents a good summary of the views contained in the volume:

"To the high courts of education we would say, Remodel carefully your laws and ordinances. The mischiefs arising from the separation of the sexes during the period of

education are such as to make their co-education imperative. Youth can not be driven and overworked in one sex with more impunity than in the other. Boys as well as girls break down under severe study, men as well as women, and at least as often. Let a milder and more humane *regime* be devised and enforced. No one loses health through the lessons of wisdom wisely explained. It is the hurried, undigested (also indigestible) tuition which nauseates and fatigues. Let the community be careful not only of what is taught, but of how it is taught. And, above all, in view of the good of society, let not man and woman, who are to be partners in all the earnest tasks of life, come forth from a separate and unequal discipline, to meet as strangers in their fiery youth. What knowledge of character, what insight into sympathy and compatibility, may we not hope to find among young people who have met in the august presence of wisdom and science; who have assisted each other, not in the maze of a bewildering dance, but in noble operations of intellect, in unraveling the problems of the ages, in building the structure of the social world!

"And to parents may we not say: Do not longer feel obliged to surrender your daughters, in the very bloom of their youthful powers, to the unintelligent dominion of Fashion. You subject them to the extravagant, immodest rules of display; you expose them to the intercourse of flattery and folly, to the poison of heated and crowded rooms late hours, and luxurious suppers. You countenance the lavish waste of time, talent, sensibility, and money; and all this because without it your daughters may not marry. And with it, indeed, they may not. Take courage, then, and come to a loftier stand. Educate the future wives with the future husbands. Give the two in common the highest enjoyments and the happiest memories. Then shall the marriage-wreath crown the pair in its true human dignity, never to be displaced or lost."

Just now we are having several experiments made that will serve to illustrate which of the views is the better—the one presented by Dr. Clarke, or the one in this volume. It may be that the doctor has considerably overdrawn the picture of the evils as he sees them, but it is by no means certain that he is mistaken in the main features of his book. Still we are quite willing that these lady reviewers shall have a fair chance, as well as the girls, and we therefore vote to suspend judgment until all the facts are in.

- 
- 7.—*The Revelation of John.* Expounded by JOHN PETER LANGE, D. D., Professor of Theology in the University of Bonn. Translated from the German, by EVELINA MOORE. Enlarged and Edited by E. R. CRAVEN, D. D., Pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church at Newark, N. J. Together with a Double Alphabetical Index to all the Ten Volumes of the New Testament, by JOHN H. WOODS, A. M. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Geo. E. Stevens & Co. 1874. 8mo. pp. 446-45.

To write a satisfactory Commentary on the Apocalypse is a very difficult task. There have been so many theories of interpretation, that one is almost bewildered at the outset. But surely the book has a clear and definite meaning; and, if so, this certainly can be understood. However much commentators may clash with each other, we must believe that the book is what its name imports, or else it should no longer be regarded as canonical.

Whatever may be said of other Commentaries, we think it will be generally conceded that Dr. Lange's work is of the very greatest value. It is  
VOL. VI.—27

characterized throughout by that plodding industry, conscientious thoroughness, which mark all the writings of its distinguished author.

Dr. Lange seeks first for the symbolical key, and proceeds to treat the book as an allegorical production. In respect to the construction of the Apocalypse he says:

"We adhere to the opinion that it is systematically arranged in cyclical collective pictures (pictures of the whole), which are always representative of the entire course of the world down to the period of its end; and yet, in the succession which they are made to observe, are constantly advancing to that end. The succession of these cycles, which are modified by the number seven, is in exact correspondence with the movement, development, and perfection of macrocosmical life—from within, outward. The Seven Churches, in their symbolical significance, constitute not simply an introduction to the book; as the kernel and center of the world's history, they form the determinative, fundamental idea of the book. The Seven Seals constitute the history of the world, in relation to the Seven Churches. The Seven Trumpets follow, as Divine judgments upon, or penitential (exhorting to repentance) trumpets over, seven specific corruptions or forms of sin in the Church. Then ensue the Seven Thunders, as sealed life-pictures of the times of awakening and of refreshment in the Church. Only in the face of these powers of the world to come can the Seven Heads of the Antichristian Beast develop; the seven world-monarchies ending in the consummation of Antichristian in the Antichrist; the demoniac reaction of world-history against the kingdom of God. On the other hand, antichristian evil on its side calls forth the Seven Vials of Anger, the judgments of hardening, the last of which unfolds into the three special judgments upon the Harlot, the Beast, and Satan, being afterward summed up again in the general judgment of the world. That this general judgment then ushers in the Seventh Day, the eternal Sabbath of God, is a conclusion which the seer has scenically portrayed, rather than expressly declared. His particular reason for withholding such a declaration is probably to be found in the fact that he has at the outset, in the prologue, announced the complete revelation of God in Christ as a revelation of the Seven Spirits in Christ, or in the fact that the number seven results from the number six.

Until recently, it has been difficult to obtain any thing like a correct Greek text of the Apocalypse. But the labors of Tregelles and Tischendorf have overcome many of the difficulties formerly in the way of the commentator, in giving to him a much improved text of the original.

The additions of the American editor are numerous, and frequently very valuable. He is a pre-millennarian, though his views are never offensively presented. The abstracts, giving the views of various commentators, will, we think, be found very valuable, especially to those who have not the means of procuring expensive works.

The volume concludes with a copious Index to all the volumes on the New Testament,—first, of Greek Words; and, second, of Topics. This Index is very complete, and will be found very useful to the general student.

---

8.—*The Superhuman Origin of the Bible Inferred from Itself.* By HENRY ROGERS. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 8vo. pp. 465.

A NEW book by the author of "The Eclipse of Faith," is sure to attract attention. The present work has occupied Mr. Rogers's mind for a number



of years, and may be regarded as embodying his ripest thoughts on the subjects of which it treats. There is nothing strikingly original about the matter, though the method adopted is likely to be very effective in producing conviction in the minds of all honest, careful readers. The contents embrace a discussion of "Traits in the Bible, which seem at variance with certain principles and tendencies of human nature;" "Ancillary arguments drawn from certain traits of the New Testament, as contrasted with what might be expected from the antecedents of the writers;" "Arguments derived from, first, Coincidences between certain statements of Scripture, and certain facts of history: second, Indications of the unity of the Bible;" "Certain peculiarities of style in the Scriptural writers;" "The exceptional position of the Bible in the world," etc.

These subjects are all discussed in a style that is remarkable for perspicuity, and in a manner that ought to do much good for the cause of truth.

We welcome the volume as a really valuable contribution to our apologetic literature.

- 
- 9.—*The Holy Bible According to the Authorized Version* (A. D. 1611); with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a Revision of the Translation. By BISHOPS AND OTHER CLERGY OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH. Edited by F. C. COOK, M. A., Canon of Exeter, Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. Vol. IV. Job—Psalms—Proverbs—Ecclesiastes—The Song of Solomon. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 8vo. pp. 702.

THIS work, so far, justifies all the promise it gave in the beginning. As a concise, learned, yet popular commentary, it has no equal in the English language. If we were to find fault at all, we should say that there is occasionally a little too much of the Bible Dictionary. We think that a commentator should confine himself almost exclusively to exegesis, and all other matters should be passed by, except so far as they are necessary to give the exact meaning of the text.

In the exposition of the Prophetic Psalms, there is a little too much of the old method in giving a double meaning to Scripture. That system of interpretation ought to have been buried long ago, and it is not altogether creditable to Canon Cook that such a fossil should have place in this volume.

The volume closes with the Song of Solomon, and the method of treating this may be gathered from a paragraph taken from the Introduction.

"The following commentary proceeds on the assumption that the primary subject and occasion of the poem was a real historical event, of which we have here the only record—the marriage union of Solomon with a shepherd maiden of Northern Palestine, by whose beauty and nobility of soul the great king had been captivated. Starting from this historical basis, we assume, further, that the Song of Songs, as the work of one endued by inspiration with that wisdom 'which overseeth all things' (Wisd. viii, 23), and so contem-

plates them from the highest point of view, is in its essential character an ideal representation of human love in the relation of marriage; that which is universal and common in its operation to all mankind being here set forth in one grand typical instance."

- 
- 10.—*Animal Locomotion; or Walking, Swimming, and Flying; with a Dissertation on Aeronautics.* By J. BELL PETTIGREW, M. D., F. R. S., F. R. S. E., F. R. C. P. E., Pathologist to the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, Curator of the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, etc. Illustrated by one hundred and thirty engravings on wood. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cincinnati: Robt. Clarke & Co. 1874. 12mo. pp. 264.

We hope no one will be frightened away from this book by the long string of letters annexed to the author's name. A careful examination of what he has written will be quite sufficient to convince most people that he knows something, without the aid of so many cabalistic signs.

One could scarcely hope that so much that is really entertaining could be written upon a subject so apparently dry. But Mr. Pettigrew has written with a soul in his subject, as well as a full understanding of the science of locomotion.

The book contains an intensely interesting chapter on Aeronautics. A number of cuts of flying-machines are given, while the possibilities and difficulties of Aeronautics are discussed with admirable clearness. The book is not only entertaining, but is full of useful instruction.

- 
- 11.—*Responsibility in Mental Disease.* By HENRY MAUDSLEY, M. D., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, Professor of Medical Jurisprudence in University College, London, etc. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 12mo. pp. 313.

THE International Series is more than meeting public expectation. Each successive volume but makes it evident that the plan is a wise one. A library of science, which the masses can read and understand, is the idea; and, so far, this idea has in a large degree been made practical.

The volume before us is ably written, and discusses a subject of great importance. Some of its facts are stranger than fiction, while most of its subjects are such as should be understood by a large class of people who are now almost entirely ignorant of them.

- 
- 12.—*Brief Essays and Brevities.* By GEORGE H. CALVERT. Boston: Lee & Shepard. New York: Lee, Shepard & Dillingham. Cincinnati: George E. Stevens & Co. 1874. 16mo. pp. 282.

THE essays of this volume embrace considerable range of subjects, and are, for the most part, lively discussions of interesting things. It is an

excellent Summer book—a book that one can read without any strain, and yet be profited. Along with some stale platitudes, it contains some original thoughts, and very many useful hints upon intellectual, social, and religious life. The style is sometimes very crisp; and when free from affectation, which frequently mars it, it is generally perspicuous and strong.

Some of the essays are really good, others are only medium, while a few could have been left out without any very serious disadvantage to the book. As a whole, it seeks to illustrate the American idea of thinking, viz: A straight line is the shortest distance between two points.

---

## FOREIGN LITERATURE.

### BOOKS.

- 1.—*Le Baptême. Par R. BEZOLES. Avec une Preface par EMILE BURNOUF, Directeur de L'Ecole Française d'Athènes.* (Baptism, by R. BEZOLES. With a Preface by EMILE BURNOUF, Director of the French School at Athens.) Paris: Maisonneuve & Co. 1874. 8vo. pp. 228.

THIS book belongs to a series on the "Science of Religions," and is designed to set forth the baptismal doctrine and ritual of the modern Greek Church. The author is competent to write on subjects concerning the life and habits of the modern Greeks, as he has resided among them, is a man of intelligence and literary culture, and has made the topics which he treats the objects of special study. He has, as it appears, given special attention to the religious customs among the modern Greeks, and has found these subjects of special interest and pleasure to him. In the Preface he says:

"I am writing on the Baptism, Marriage, and the Funerals of the Modern Greeks—themes very interesting, picturesque, and strange, especially to us people of the West, habituated to other customs.

"These are the three land-marks of life. Every thing is embraced in these; here every thing begins, or ends.

"I have begun with Baptism, and the following is the division of my work:

"1. First, I have translated the ritual of the two baptisms, that of the great 'Euchologion' (Greek Prayer-book), and that of the Roman ritual, and placed them side by side. In a *résumé*, I have pointed out the difference between the two rituals.

"2. In an historical sketch I have endeavored to show how, on these very simple words uttered by Jesus, 'Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,' men have accumulated this liturgical mass of prayers, exorcisms, insufflations, litanies, and signs of the cross.

"3. To complete this work, I have been obliged, sometimes, to have recourse to the profane element. I have described all the rational and superstitious customs according to

all the light that I have been able, after much diligent research, to gather here and there.

"4. Finally, in an extended Glossary, I have given the explanation of the words, the meaning of which might be difficult to the reader.

"I have been less concerned to set forth the dogma than the ceremonial part of baptism; after reading this book, the dogmatic part will be more interesting and edifying. The ceremonies have their lesson, their morality, their charm, their poetical, philosophical, social, and historical side."

The Greek baptismal ceremonial is very long and burdensome; there are, as given here from the "Euchologion," no less than eleven prayers in the ritual. Three of these are prayers of exorcism—there are three distinct exorcisms. This is all after the manner of the ancient Greek Church and Greek Christian mind, where every thing in creed and ecclesiastical ceremonial had to be expressed with great particularity, copiousness, and rich stateliness of language. The language of the rituals of the Western Churches, beginning with the Roman, is much more brief. This marks a distinction between the Greek and the Western minds.

The author gives us a description of the Greek baptism, which he frequently witnessed. In striking contrast with the Roman Church, the orthodox baptism is, as a rule, administered in the house of the family, in the midst of rejoicings of the household:

"In the house where the baptism is to be celebrated, there is an unwonted stir; joy shines in every face; every thing puts on a festival air. The household is busy with the preparations for the ceremony. In the baptismal chamber, the candles, the vase of oil, the white robe, the soap, the towels, the sweetmeats, the *kolymbethra* (baptistery), the vase of the *μύρον*, the sacerdotal vestments, are prepared by the family or the servants of the Church. One after the other, the invited guests hurry in; the priests come in slowly. The candles are now lighted; the officiating catechist puts on the *epitrachilion* (a rich, broad band around the neck, falling down low in front), and the *phenolion* (or *phelonion*—*penula*—a large, sleeveless, gold-embroidered cape), and the catechising begins.

"The devil who is in possession of the infant, the water, and the oil, is anathematized, conjured, cursed, driven away, in the name of God who has created all, in the name of the three Divine persons, in the name of the celestial powers whose power balances that of the powers of darkness. The infant is then taught concerning the creation of our first parents, their perfect state, their fall, the incarnation of the Son of God, of his birth, of his life, and his expiatory death.

"This done, the infant is first to declare aloud its faith, and in its name the godfather recites three times the Apostles' Creed; then it must renounce Satan, and attach itself forever to Jesus Christ, which the godfather does in its name nine times. This ends the catechising. While this has been going on, the guests do not appear very attentive or serious; all are waiting for the chief ceremony. Now, as the baptism is about to take place, all arrange themselves around the *kolymbethra* and the infant. All want to see the little stranger which is crying in the arms of the *mammi* (the accoucheuse); all eyes are turned to it. For it these tapers burn; for it are these ornaments, this animation every-where. . . . It would seem that, in the orthodox baptism, the family had a greater share than the Church. A Christian is made of this new-born infant; but it is done at home, under the eyes of the grandparents, the members of the family, the friends and guests.

"In the mean time the deacon recites the litanies, to which the choir responds from time to time by the low murmur of *Κύριε ἰλέησαι*—(*Lord, have mercy!*) By and by the exorcisms, the insufflations, the prayers, the signs of the cross are finished over the infant, the water, and the oil. Then a large vase of warm water is brought and poured into the *kolymbethra*.

The priest pours oil into this baptistery, making the signs of the cross. Then, before immersing in the sacred bath the new catechumen, the priest and the sponsor anoint it with the holy oil. At this moment the sponsor whispers into the ear of the priest the name to be given to the child. This he has kept concealed as a profound secret; neither mother, nor father, nor family, nor friends, knew it. You can then imagine the explosion of joy, the exclamations that break forth from the assembly when the priest, aloud, at the anointing, pronounces the name. The children run to announce it to the parents, who, less fortunate, according to custom, are absent from the baptismal ceremony. The priest then takes the infant, and dips it, and re-dips, in the saving bath, at the invocation of each person of the Trinity, and then returns it to the *mammi*. Then, after having cut from its head, in the form of the cross, three tufts of hair, which he throws into the *kolymbethra*, he clothes the infant in the white robe, while the hymns are chanted, and the sponsor, with the *mammi* and the priest, make three times the tour around the sacred font.

"Immediately afterward, the *μύρον*, or confirmation, is administered to the infant—a precious unguent, a sweet and strengthening chrism, composed of symbolical perfumes and aromatics, which receives from the Holy Spirit the plenitude of its gifts, and makes of the newly baptized a perfect and finished Christian.\* . . . The deacon having recited the Epistle, the priest repeats the Gospel, and the religious ceremony is ended.

"Then come general joy and felicitations. . . . The *agapae*—that is, cakes, comfits, sweetmeats, wine, liquors—are handed around on large plates, and thus the joyous ceremony ends.

"Eight days after the baptism, according to the 'Euchologion,' the child is to be taken to the church to be washed by the priest. This ceremony, which still was practiced in the last century, has entirely fallen into disuse; and the child is now, after eight days, only taken to the church to receive the communion."

In baptizing the infant, the priest, "in the name of the Father, dips it in the bath up to the neck, and puts the water on its head copiously with his right-hand; in the name of the Son, and performs the second immersion like the first; and of the Holy Spirit, and performs the third immersion like the others." The head of the child is not plunged under the water like the rest of the body. This is to prevent strangling in the helpless infant; yet the act is intended to be, and is called, a complete immersion. This defect, again, is the result of the unauthorized innovation of *infant* baptism, which has obliged the later Greek Church thus far to depart somewhat from apostolic usage, and to stultify, to this extent, its own argument and doctrine as to the unquestioned meaning of the word baptism. The head, however, is really thoroughly covered with water.

The *kolymbethra*, or baptistery—a classic word, signifying a swimming or diving bath—is thus described by the author:

"The Greek baptistery, called the *kolymbethra*, is a large basin of copper, in the form of a cauldron, or of a *crater* (mixer-bowl). It belongs to the parish Church, and is taken to the home of the infant some time before the baptism is to take place."

\* This "*μύρον* is a mixture of oil, wine, and *thirty-eight* aromatic substances; the oil, however, is the principal one. It is consecrated by the Patriarch of Constantinople, on Holy Thursday, with the greatest pomp and solemnity. The whole night preceding the consecration is spent in preparing the mixture, by grinding it in a mortar, and then boiling it in a cauldron, both of huge dimensions, under the eye of experienced men. The quantity of each ingredient is given with great exactness in the 'Great Euchologion.' From the patriarch every orthodox Church, without exception, must obtain its *μύρον*." The author gives us the long list of these precious ingredients, all of which are symbolical. What an illustration of the miserable rubbish of traditions that has been accumulating mountain-high for ages, and with which men in their folly have chosen to load their necks, to the rejection of the simplicity of the Gospel and of its institutions!

The author is very decided in his declarations in behalf of immersion as the baptismal act, and against any other form. On the question (page 98), "What was the mode of baptizing?" he says:

"In the primitive Church, baptism was performed by *immersion*; and this is the manner preserved to our own day by the orthodox.

"On this point the proofs are abundant, and it is difficult to understand how the Roman Church has abandoned this apostolic usage to baptize by *ablution*."

Then he quotes Tertullian, St. Jerome, and Gregory the Great, as teaching immersion, and adds:

"We have said that the Roman Church baptizes by ablution. It has not, however, carried this so far as to abolish baptism by immersion where it has already existed since time immemorial, as in the Church of Milan." (There it is yet practiced.)

"Furthermore, in the thirteenth century, St. Thomas (Aquinas) taught (*Summa Theol., Pars III, quest. 66, art. 8*): "Sed cessante tali causâ (scandalum vel hæretici dogmatis usum) communiter observatur in baptismo trina immersio. Et ideo graviter peccaret aliter baptizans, quasi ecclesiæ ritum non observans." But such a cause being removed, trine immersion is practiced in common in baptism. And for this reason he would grievously sin who would baptize in any other way, as one who does not observe the rite of the Church."

Our author then cites the passage from Alexander Stourdza that so strongly advocates immersion, and condemns the other modes.

Again (page 150), he says:

"The Roman Church baptizes by ablution. This is only the shadow of the primitive baptism. One drop of water suffices, say the theologians. And yet John the Baptist, Jesus, the apostles, the primitive Church, did not do so. There are modern pictures representing Jesus in the Jordan, the water rising hardly to his knees, the head inclined, and John holding in his hand a large sea-shell, and pouring on the head of the Galilean the water he had taken from the stream. These are anachronisms."

There is practiced among the Greeks what is called νεκροβάπτισμα (literally, baptism of the dead); but it is, in fact, only baptism of the dying—a baptism *in extremis*. Much has been said about this curious custom, and much that is erroneous. Our author, who has taken pains to get a correct knowledge of this practice, gives the following account of it:

"The baptism *in extremis* is called among the modern Greeks νεκροβάπτισμα (literally 'baptism of the dead,' instead of 'baptism of the dying.') It is a figure of rhetoric which allows the use of this word by anticipation—a prolepsis; for, really, the child which is baptized *in extremis* is often rather dead than alive.

"The Greeks do not, then, baptize the dead; they give baptism to living or moribund infants, and this is what they mean by νεκροβάπτισμα.

"When, in the interval of the eight days which legally separate the infant from the baptismal ceremony, it is seen that it will die, and that it is not possible to call a priest to prepare the *kolymbethra*, some person takes oil from the lamp which burns before the holy images,\* anoints the infant with it; then, taking it up, lowers and raises it three times, pronouncing the sacramental words of baptism: 'Such a one, servant of God, is baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.' This triple immersion in the air is a shadow of immersion in the water; and since it is performed in good faith, and in a case of absolute necessity, the orthodox Church recognizes it as valid, and accords to it the effects of the ordinary immersion. . . . The

\* In every Greek family are kept, in a retired room, holy images, and before them a lamp is kept burning day and night.



infant's soul is not lost; it goes to heaven. On the contrary, the infant dies without this baptism, it is punished (*χολάζεται*); its soul is lost (*Χάνεται ἡ ψυχὴ του.*) It is also a punishment for the parents. . . . The orthodox do not hold that the infant which dies without baptism suffers the punishment of fire; they believe that it is only deprived of the sight of God face to face. If, contrary to expectations, the child does not die, the priest confers on it, afterward, the *μύρον*, or confirmation."

The author gives an interesting account of the many strange superstitions, relics of pagan Greece, that are connected in the minds of the common people with baptism; such as the "evil eye," "the demon of the South, the *Μοῖραι*, or fairies (literally the Fates), etc.

In connection with a description of the priestly garments, the *kolym-bethra*, etc., are given excellent pictures illustrating these objects. The book constitutes certainly a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the religion of the modern Greeks.

---

2.—*Die Sociale Frage, und die innere Mission. Zwei Betrachtungen, von Prof. Dr. J. E. KUNZE.* (The Social Question and Home Missions. By Professor J. E. KUNZE.) Leipsic. 1873. pp. 159.

THERE is now no thoughtful mind that does not begin to understand and feel more and more the immense moment of the question treated in this book. Not many years since, the pretensions, the efforts, and manifestations of "social reformers" were treated by the general mind as chimerical and unworthy of serious attention. The world is so disposed to go on in its old, quiet ways undisturbed, that it is slow to recognize the need and the actual near presence of radical revolutionary reforms. This is, above all, true in social questions. Men are sooner willing to change, often very radically, in religion, and even in politics, than in matters of social life. The history of the past, but especially of our own age, gives the amplest proofs of this.

But what is truer than this: that all important changes, such as religious and political, will at once begin to influence the whole great machinery of social life? Old habits will resist with long-enduring tenacity, often with arms and blood; and terrible revolutions, sudden national and social earthquakes, upheavals and disruptions, that seem to threaten the very life of nations and of societies, alone seem sometimes able to effect the last, ripe, inevitable changes—the effect of long, powerful, persistent attacks, and as long and as powerful and tenacious resistances. We have seen this in the Old World often; and very lately our own land has given the world a most terrible example of it. There are always those who, idle and falsely secure, repeat to themselves, for their daily consolation, "It will not be in my day;" and—good, easy souls—how often have they been suddenly and terribly awakened to their self-deception!

All the nations of the enlightened world—the whole social fabric—are

beginning sensibly to feel the presence and strong pressure of this great "social question." We are beginning to recognize its real and true demands that must be heeded; the terrible evils that its perverted character and spirit carries in its womb, that must be understood, met and averted; and, finally, the necessity of a safe, wise, and just solution that *must* be given to the question. The necessity is imminent, and it must be met.

This social question enters into and affects all the interests of society. As it now stands before us, it has necessarily taken into its character and life, politics, social science, religion. This could not be otherwise. Therefore it is a question with which government and religion and social philosophy, all have to do. This is now recognized.

Our author has divided his work into two *betrachtungen* (considerations). First, he considers the social question; and, secondly, home missions, with reference to it. He has treated the first division with clearness and impartiality, and as fully as his space allowed; in the second, he gives us a very satisfactory account of what has been done in Germany to meet the social wants, by *mission-houses*, in many of the principal cities, as a work of Christian evangelical—that is, Protestant—intelligence and charity. It is cheering and encouraging to see an enlightened Christian man treat this difficult, and, in many respects—in its actual present forms—ugly question, with intelligent candor, and in the proper spirit of a true Christian love of humanity—all humanity—the ignorant, depraved, erring, as well as the good and the enlightened. This is not always done. It is oftener found cheapest, more convenient, for ignorance and prejudice, only to defame and denounce; but this method neither leads to a proper understanding nor solution of such momentous questions.

The author fully recognizes the magnitude of the social question:

"Among the numerous great questions of the present, one of the greatest is the so-called *social question*. This form of the question means to express the purpose of a transformation or subversion in its very fundamental lines of the universal system of economy; for by *society*—civil society—the social field, in the widest sense, is understood nowadays the sum of the laws and forms, according to and in which the economical life of humanity, especially of the civilized world, is developed and administered; and all its material and ethical factors, which aid in conditioning and determining the economical life, are arranged.

"But the social question appears now especially in the form of the *labor question*. By this expression is to be indicated that in the economical position of labor is contained the chief problem; and in the organization and rising up of the *estate of the laborers*, the principal manifestations of the social movement of our time.

"This social or labor question, then, it is which excites alike the understanding as the feeling. What has occurred in the last decade has revealed the magnitude of the question? Even the blindest and most careless are becoming aware that, in the future, we shall have to calculate with new factors; and civil society is beginning to feel the ground giving way under its feet. Old interests are put under ban, and new ideas rise up. Close by the threshold of the firmly hitherto secured *property*, there stands posted with watchful, eager eye, the monster of the greedy covetousness of the *propertyless*; and with the labor-question are involved the manifestations of *pauperism* and the proletariat, to make this difficult question still more difficult."

The strange perversities and peculiar troubles of this question, our author sees and proposes to meet as a Christian alone ought to meet them.

"A specially strange characteristic of this movement is, that the lower strata of the people, who have been seized by it, in the midst of a world of Christianity, yet despise and mock Christ, who called out to them, 'Come unto me all ye that *labor* and are *heavy laden*, and I will give you rest;' and reject the Gospel which was, above all, preached to the poor. Heretofore the oppressed and suffering have always felt a natural tendency to the Word of God, that comes down on their hearts like morning dew and sunlight; now we have before us this perversion of nature, that in the most grievous need the best help is despised, and those who would bring this relief, for their reward gain only insult and contempt.

"Then comes this other fact, that history, which is called an eloquent teacher (that is, the experiences, instructions, admonitions, and warnings that are found in the events of past times, and other nations), is treated as no longer worthy of any attention, and as of no value. The haughty spirit of man, that holds and accepts nothing more from God, not even relief and help, rejects, in like manner, the authority of history. Self-help and individual reason—this is the watchword of a new generation, that desires a future without a past, and impiously dares to solve this difficult question by its own strength, and to meet the immense demands of materials for this solution alone from the means afforded by the present.

"But shall we, who have clear views of this question, and sincerely love even its partisans, therefore become weary, without ceasing again to direct men to the power of the Gospel and the treasures of history? It is a question that involves the salvation of our children, the future of our people, the blessings of culture, and the honor of our God; therefore, alongside of the words of many others, a modest place may also be allowed to our word. What we propose to say is embraced in the answer to the question, *What has the Christian to do with reference to the social question?* The answer divides itself into two parts. The Christian must first seek to *gain full and clear views* of the facts involved in the question; and, second, he must *actively co-operate* in the efforts at its solution."

Such are our author's views of the question, and such the method and purpose of his book. It is one of the best contributions to the already abundant literature on this question, and especially valuable and welcome, as it treats the question in a serious, calm, as well as thorough manner, and in the high spirit of candor and Christian charity. Such a treatment of this great question alone is right and productive of good.

- 
- 3.—*Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen, von Dr. FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE, Ordentl. Professor der Classischen Philologie an der Universität, Basel. Erstes Stück: David Strauss, der Bekenner und der Schriftsteller.* (Unwelcome Reflections, by Dr. FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE, Ordinary Professor of Classical Philology at the University of Bale. First Part: David Strauss, the Confessor and Author.) Leipzig. 1873. 8vo. pp. 101.

THE author calls his "Reflections" (*Unzeitgemässe*) "unsuited to the times;" not because they are so, in his own judgment—for then he would not have written and published them—but because he knows they are not in harmony with the present spirit of Germany, and are unacceptable and unwelcome to it. A mind of a thoroughly German mold and temper, the

author, placed in an eminent position in German Switzerland, in the first university of the Helvetic Republic, is nevertheless a dispassionate, unprejudiced judge of the mind and spirit of the Great Father-land to-day. The transforming, epoch-making events in Germany of the last few years have so mightily affected the character of that land, and so very marked and demonstrative have been the manifestations of this transforming influence, that very many minds of the first order for culture, wisdom, and power have been awakened to even such serious "reflections" as our author here sends forth. While it is not denied that, in these great wars, Germany has advanced in power and influence with prodigious strides—greater than those of Homer's hero-gods among the nations of the earth—it is felt by these calmer philosophical thinkers that these wars have brought a deluge of evils on the land; and it is also felt that now, in these days of destructive delusions, it is, above all, the duty of light, truth, and conscience to speak the truth, and to try to awaken the nation from this dream of delusions. This duty our author has conscientiously laid on himself; and this book is the first of a series that is intended to expose the errors and weaknesses of the spirit of Germany to-day. In the present temper of Germany he expects an unwilling ear, and no thanks for words and good intentions. The author, we have said, is a German, out-and-out, in a good sense, and identifies himself fully with the German people. It is *his* land, *his* people, he is talking about.

It is really refreshing and encouraging—it makes us think better, and *not* despair of our humanity—to see, among a mighty people, that are swept, in a day of tremendous achievements, by a deluge of exultations and self-glorifications that makes dissent from the general feeling almost high treason and *leze-majesty*, men of intellectual and moral power arise, in the confidence and dignity of truth and righteousness, and call back their people from the destructive delirium of the hour to soberness, to a consciousness of their errors and sins. Alas! the number of these prophets of righteousness and truth is not, even among the best nations, too great! The spirit and purpose of the author, and the evils he sees and is seeking to combat, are revealed in the very beginning of his book:

"The public opinion in Germany," so he opens, "seems to forbid to speak of the evil and dangerous consequences of the war, especially of one victoriously ended. The more readily are those authors listened to, who know no more important opinion than this public one, and are therefore active in eager rivalry to praise the war, and to trace the mighty phenomenon of its influence on morality, culture, and art, with jubilant notes. In spite of this it must be said, a great victory is a great danger. Human nature is less able to endure it than a great defeat; indeed, it seems even easier to gain such a victory, than so to bear it that no heavier defeat will come from it. But from all the evil consequences that the last victorious war with France draws after it, the worst, perhaps, is a widespread, indeed universal error—the error of the public, and of all who in a public way express their opinion—that German culture, too, gained a victory, and should therefore now also be crowned with the laurel-wreaths that are worthy of such extraordinary events and

results. This delusion is in the highest degree injurious; not simply because it is a delusion—for there are errors that may have very salutary and happy influences—but because it may change our victory into utter defeat,—*in the defeat, yea, the extirpation, of the German spirit for the benefit of the German Empire.*

"Even if it be assumed that two cultures have measured their strength with each other, the standard for the victorious would be a very relative one, and would by no means justify, under the circumstances, a jubilation of victory or a self-glorification. For much might depend upon this, to know what that subjugated culture was worth—perhaps very little; in which case the victory, even with great results for the conquering arms, would not involve a triumph for the victorious culture. On the other side, in our case, for the simplest reasons, we can claim no victory whatever for German culture; for French culture continues to exist as it did before, and we are dependent upon it as before. Not even with the victory of arms had culture any thing to do. Strict military discipline, natural bravery and endurance, superiority of the leaders, unity and obedience among the soldiers—in short, elements that have nothing to do with culture, secured to us a victory over an enemy who was wanting in the chief of these elements.

"In what sense can German culture have been victorious, if we should separate from it German learning? In none. For the moral qualities of a stricter discipline, of a quiet obedience, have nothing to do with culture. The Macedonian armies, for example, in these qualities were incomparably superior to the armies of the more cultivated Greeks. It is a confounding of two things with each other (learning and culture), when we talk of the victory of German culture; and that arises from the fact that in Germany the pure conception of culture has been lost."

On the question of culture or no culture in Germany, our author gives us some decided utterances. These are worthy of consideration:

"Culture is, above all, the unity of the style of art in all the manifestations of the life of a people. Much knowledge and much learning, however, is neither a necessary means of culture, nor an evidence of it, and can even be perfectly consistent with the opposite of culture—barbarism; that is, the absence of style, or the chaotic confusion of all styles.

"But in this chaotic confusion of all styles the German of our day lives; and it is a serious problem how it is possible for him, with all his learning, not to become aware of this, and even, in addition to this, to rejoice with all his heart in what he calls his present 'culture' (*Bildung*). And yet every thing ought to teach him better—every look at his dress, his room, his house, every walk through the streets of his cities, every inspection of the magazines of the merchants in fine fabrics. In the midst of social life he should become aware of the origin of his manners and movements; in the midst of our institutions of arts, concert-rooms, theaters, and museums, he should become conscious of the disordered tumbling together of all possible styles. The forms, colors, products, and curiosities of all times and of all zones, the German collects and piles up, and out of it produces that modern chaos of variety and confusion (*Jahrmarktsbuntheit*) which again his learned men—his *Gelehrten*—have to study and formulate as the 'modern in itself' (*das moderne in sich*); he himself sits down quietly in this tumult of all styles. With this kind of 'culture,' which is simply phlegmatic insensibility for all culture, we can not conquer enemies, and least of all such as, like the French, have a real productive culture, whatever may be its true value, and whom we have thus far imitated in every thing, and that, too, most unskillfully.

"Had we really ceased to imitate them, we would, for that reason, not yet have triumphed over them, but only have freed ourselves from them. Only then, when we shall have forced upon them an original German culture, it would be time to talk of a triumph of German culture. In the mean time we must observe that now, as before, we are dependent on Paris for all that concerns form, and are obliged to be dependent; for, as yet, there is no such thing as a German original culture.

"All of us should know this of our own accord. Indeed, one of the few who have a right to tell it to the Germans in a tone of reproach, has betrayed this publicly. 'We Germans are but of yesterday,' said Goethe, once to Eckermann. 'We have, it is true, been

cultivating vigorously for a century; but two centuries may yet pass away before so much mind and culture will penetrate among our countrymen, and become general, that it can be said of them, "*It is long ago since they were barbarians.*"

There is a ruling spirit in Germany, says our author, that, perfectly satisfied with all it is now—confident of no defect, no lack, that feels no need of being any thing more than what Germany now is—denies therefore, and forbids, any further seeking, any further progress.

"What power is so mighty as to prescribe this 'shall not?' What species of men must have gained dominion in Germany to forbid such strong and simple feelings (after what is higher and better), or at least to be able to prevent their expression? This power, this species of men, I will call by name: it is the *Bildungs-Philister*.

"The word *Philister* (Philistine), it is well known, is taken from student-life, and designates, in its wider but quite popular sense, the antithesis of the son of the muses (the *Musen-sohn*—the worshiper of the Muses), the artist, the genuine man of culture. The *Bildungs-Philister*, however—to study whose type, to listen to whose confessions, when he makes any, has now become a burdensome duty—is distinguished from the general idea of the genus *Philister* by a superstition. He imagines that he is himself a child of the muses, and a man of culture—a conceit difficult to understand, and from which it is clear that he does not know at all what *Philister* and its antithesis mean; wherefore we would not wonder if he should solemnly swear that he was no *Philister*. With all this want of this self-knowledge, he is firmly convinced that his *Bildung* (his education and culture) are precisely the complete expression of the true German culture; and as he every-where finds those educated (*gebildete*) after his own fashion, and finds all public institutions, all the establishments of education, culture, and art, in accordance with his own education (*Gebildetheit*) and his own wants, he also carries about with him every-where the triumphant feeling of being the worthy representative of German culture, and makes his claims and demands accordingly."

If any one denies his high claims and declarations; if any one points out general and great defects, and demands what is better, this famous Philistine, this representative man, with the completest self-assurance and the most sovereign air of unquestionable authority, rebukes such impertinent presumption.

"He denies, conceals, stops his ears, will not look; he is a negative being, even in his hate and enmity. But he hates no one more than him who treats him as a *Philistine*, and who tells him what he is; namely, a hinderance to all that is powerful and creative, the labyrinth for all the doubters and the lost; the morass for all the weary; the foot-fetters to all that are running after higher aims; the poisonous vapors for all fresh germs; the burning, withering sand-waste for the German spirit seeking and longing after a better life."

And so our author goes on to describe the *Philistine*, this Bohun-Upas, this withering blight, this destructive plague of the great German nation—this Philistine who seems now to claim and hold dominion there over the people—and its many great spirits, who are wrestling with all their might against the destructive tendency of this Philistinism and its intolerable arrogance, now, alas! triumphant!

A large part, then, of our author's book is devoted to David Strauss, on the ground of his last book, "*A Confession*," whom he regards "a typical *Philistine*," and "one perfectly satisfied with our present state of culture." To show this typical Philistine in Strauss, is a main design of this book;



and with vigorous, bold hand our author executes this design. This honest, strong book should be treated as it deserves—read by all the many serious and earnest men of Germany; and the Philistines, too—and well pondered. May it fulfill its much-needed mission well!

- 
- 4.—*Die Buecher Samuelis. Von Dr. CHR. FR. DAVID ERDMANN. Des Alten Testaments VI Theil. Theologisch-Homiletisches Bibel-werk.* (The Books of Samuel, by Dr. CHR. FR. DAVID ERDMANN. Part VI of the Old Testament.) 1873. Large 8vo. pp. 575.

THIS is another volume, the sixth part, of the Old Testament portion of Lange's "*Bibel-Werk*." It has been long looked for as one of the most important historical books of the Old Testament; and now, as it has finally made its appearance from the hands of a man well selected for the task, and, as it should be, after long and patient and thorough labor, the matured work is welcomed in its place in this great Bible Commentary.

It is very true, as Dr. Erdmann says in his Preface, "Old Testament studies are yet greatly neglected;" and, in this Western country, much more than in the Old World, attention to the Hebrew Scriptures, and a thorough acquaintance with them, are, even among educated Bible students, to say nothing of the common people, very far behind what they should be. And yet the Old Testament, in its history, prophesies, language, etc., is the groundwork of the New. The former can not be neglected without damage to the latter; the New can not be understood thoroughly and satisfactorily without a good knowledge of the Old. We must, as Christian students, as the Christian Church, come back again to a fundamental study of the Hebrew Scriptures. It should be made now, more and more, a special aim in our higher educational institutions to lead the student of Christianity, especially him that is to be an educated teacher of it, back to a proper appreciation of these great "Oracles of God," as Paul calls them—the "Holy Scriptures" of the New Testament. The study of the Hebrew language should be made prominent and as thorough as possible, as that of itself will have the effect of at once fastening the mind and heart on these wonderful books. A well-done work on the Old Testament, then, like these volumes of Lange's "*Bibel-Werk*"—scholarly productions—we should greet with joy as giving us great help in that which is daily becoming of greater importance, in the face of the deep and far-searching critical inquiries into the foundations of Bible truth. The Old Testament is really, in this respect, becoming daily more and more significant. Nothing appertaining to it must be neglected. We are tempted to quote a few passages from the very admirable Introduction, covering thirty-eight closely printed pages. And we would here say, for the satisfaction of the reader, that Dr. Erdmann's work, from first to last, is done in the spirit and from the stand-

point of a true Biblical faith, free from the destructive, ill-natured tendencies of unbelieving criticism.

On the *name* of these books, our author says :

"The name of these books does not designate their *origin*, but their chief contents. Even if the first book alone expressly relates to the labors of the judge and prophet, Samuel, and every-where places in the foreground his person, with the Divine mission he had to fulfill for Saul and David, yet the naming of both books after Samuel is justified in this, that Samuel, by his luminous presence, as it only appears in the first book in his office of judge and prophet in the light of an especial Divine mission and guidance, far transcends not only as the conclusion of the gloomy period of the judges, but also as the beginning and foundation of the divinely ordained government of kings, its first two representatives, Saul and David, in so far as they were chosen and called by him. It is Samuel, moreover, that gives to the Israelitish kingdom, that in him has its origin and existence, its true theocratic foundation and significance."

The author has given us a very instructive section on the *character and composition* of these books. Of the character of the *language* he says:

"According to the unanimous judgment of all competent critics, it is certain, beyond all doubt, that the language throughout bears the impression of true classicity, and is throughout free from Aramaic elements, the sign of a later, no longer classically pure style. While in the 'Books of Kings' there is often revealed a tendency to the Aramaic, in the 'Books of Samuel' there is, so to speak, nothing of the kind to be found, 'except a very little, such as may be seen in all books.'

"In the composition and form of the historical contents, we are at once struck with the fact that poetical pieces occur here more than in any other historical book. At the very beginning stands the lofty hymn of Hannah, which, united so intimately with the history of Samuel's birth, presents not only this event, but also the whole life and activity of Samuel in the clear light of Divine appointment and guidance. The words of the people's song of praise to David lead us to understand why Saul's heart is embittered against David by envy and jealousy. The lamentation of David over Saul and Jonathan reveal to us the noble disposition of heart which David entertained toward Saul amid all his sorrowful experiences of the latter's hatred; but, at the same time, also characterizes the judgment on Saul as from a theocratic point of view, since he celebrates only his valor, and sings him only as a hero.

"The method of the historical style is throughout this: The aim at completeness revealed by the often utmost minuteness of detail concerning events and persons; a fullness and vividness in the representation of the historical material that is not found in equal measure in the other historical books, especially the 'Books of Kings,' that seem only to give meagre extracts from their rich resources; and such a uniform immediateness and freshness in the coloring of the narration, that we can not avoid the impression that we have here before us an immediate, exact, and full statement of the narrated events, without any intervening preparation of the materials of the original sources on which the redactor or compiler of the books was dependent. The representation flows along easy, simple, attractive, without interrupting the current of the narration (as is so often, even to weariness, the case in the 'Books of Kings,' with an ever-recurring set of standing forms) by stereotyped expressions and references to its historical sources."

In a special and very complete chapter in the Introduction, our author passes in review, and satisfactorily settles and harmonizes, all the instances of "contradictions" which a hostile, destructive criticism has labored to find and establish in these books. Dr. Erdmann decides, and, we think, with all reason, that no real case of contradiction exists.